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The current debate surrounding quality schooling makes this stocktake of recent national and international research into quality teaching and school leadership timely and relevant for the teaching profession.

This report, commissioned by Teaching Australia and produced by the University of Western Sydney, provides a review and empirically-based synthesis of relevant research and seminal works published in the last five years.

Professional organisations and members of the teaching profession in each state and territory were consulted to help identify issues and gaps in the review findings and areas for further research, and to explore the need and potential uses for a research database.

Questions explored in the review include:
- What do quality teaching and school leadership contribute to improving social and academic outcomes for Australian students?
- What are the characteristics of ‘quality’ teaching?
- How is quality teaching shaped by the local and wider contexts for schooling?
- How can quality teaching be developed, communicated and sustained?
- What roles do school leaders play?
- How is the nature of school leadership evolving and responding to change?
- What are the implications of these findings for policy and practice at local, state and national levels?

**Why quality teaching and school leadership matter**

Much hope is placed on quality teaching and school leadership for the future of Australian students, citizens and workers. We have growing expectations about the ability of schooling to develop students’ skills, knowledge and understandings for an uncertain world ten to twelve years ahead, and to provide the groundwork for life-long learning for an unknowable future.

**Quality teaching and school leadership make a difference**

The research shows that quality teaching and school leadership make a difference. It identifies a range of professional attributes and practices that have a positive impact on student outcomes. Importantly, it shows that the skills and knowledge of teachers and school leaders can be strengthened through ongoing professional development, reflection and dialogue.

‘Quality teaching and school leadership’ is contextual and dynamic

In the current context of change, one of the most important findings is that quality teaching and school leadership do not involve applying a predetermined set of methods in the hope that quality education and training will follow—they are contextual and dynamic. They involve giving serious attention to, and making decisions about, an array of interacting factors that ultimately influence student and school outcomes. It is clear from the literature that improvements in the outcomes and capabilities of students are brought about by the decisions and actions of teachers and leaders themselves.

**What is ‘quality’?**

Most research literature defines ‘quality teaching’ indirectly, either through its impact on student outcomes, or through the presence of professional attributes, including skills, knowledge, qualifications and professional learning. It attempts to identify factors that are most closely associated with positive outcomes and determines how these attributes and capabilities can be developed, sustained and communicated.

Improvements in students’ social and academic outcomes, teacher performance and school-community relations can also be linked to quality school leadership—although the relationship between outcomes and the role of the principal is less direct.

**The complexity of teachers’ work**

The report provides a rich definition of quality teaching and school leadership that encapsulates the complexity of the work of teachers and school leaders. This work is complex because:

- expectations about the roles of teachers and school leaders are changing and increasing;
- the nature of school leadership is changing and becoming more dispersed; and
- teachers and school leaders have different access to the resources needed to enhance quality.

**Domains of quality teaching and school leadership**

The report proposes three inter-related “domains” of quality teaching and school leadership and uses them as a basis for organising a synthesis of recent research. To understand quality teaching and school leadership it is necessary to understand how:

- contextual factors influence the dynamics of schools and school processes in order to enhance students’ learning outcomes;
- professional practices influence students’ learning outcomes; and
- attributes and capabilities of teachers and school leaders influence students’ learning outcomes.
Contexts and challenges

A focus for policy
The OECD reports that raising the quality of teaching has provided an important focus for legislation and policies directed at education and training reforms for the future:

‘Teacher policy concerns have intensified in recent years due to the profound economic and social changes underway and the imperatives for schools to provide the foundations for lifelong learning... A key challenge is to understand the complex range of factors—societal, school-system level, and school level—that are giving rise to teacher policy concerns.’ (OECD, 2005)

However, the OECD emphasises that the quality of teaching is mediated by contextual factors that deserve our attention—‘while quality teaching is reported as important in shaping students’ social and academic developments, it is misleading to assign it exclusive salience in the educational process.’ (OECD, 2005)

Managing change
An important finding from the research is that quality teachers and school leaders have the ability to positively manage change. Maintaining student and staff morale, as well as improving teaching and learning in school, are the focus of attention for successful leaders. Managing change effectively can also involve harnessing the opportunities provided by change. The more successful were found to be less concerned about the negative effects of change, selective about the internal and external pressures they responded to, and able to harness pressures, such as government accountability measures, to serve their schools’ priorities.

School management and physical environment
Research provides evidence that a school’s management and physical environment impacts on teacher quality and student outcomes. Learning achievement increases when schools retain an educative rather than an administrative focus, with high expectations for learning outcomes supported by quality pedagogies and opportunities for self-assessment and continuing professional development. Strong leaders may also work proactively to reduce class sizes and improve the physical environment of the school, placing an emphasis on making it exciting, inviting and welcoming.

Teachers using technology
Teachers are expected to work with ever-advancing information and communication technologies to facilitate access to knowledge. They need considerable support to engage productively with new technologies as well as with their students in a new generation of learning experiences. In future research it will be important to know whether, how and why the use of multiple technologies by teachers influences or is influenced by the quality of their teaching.

Catering for diversity
Government immigration and youth policies as well as policies to boost student participation rates and assist special needs students have contributed to the increasingly diverse range of students enrolling in schools. The expectation that teachers will employ strategies to cater for the diverse qualities of students contributes to the complexity of teaching. However, research on teaching quality shows that teaching that is responsive to student diversity has a significant positive impact on both low and high achievers.

Making a difference in challenging schools
Quality teaching and school leadership can make a difference in challenging school environments, particularly through positive interaction and demonstration of care for students. The role of the school leader in these contexts is critical: one comprehensive review of research on leadership concluded there are virtually no documented instances of troubled schools being turned around without intervention by a powerful leader. There is considerable evidence about the policies and practices of leadership that are most effective in challenging contexts. However, there is little research into how successful leaders go about encouraging and supporting enhanced learning in challenging schools.

Parent expectation and choice
The increasing mobility of students and families has posed challenges for schools and school systems. Greater interstate mobility has resulted in calls for greater consistency of education policy and practice. Schools are also losing their monopoly on teaching students as parents access other sources of education and hold higher expectations for the quality of that education.

The research literature indicates expectations about the performance of schools are rising across the board—partly a result of an assumption that successful education outcomes can be expected for all students and are necessary to compete for employment. The expectations of schools and parents are not always aligned. Open two-way collaboration between parents and teachers can contribute significantly to quality teaching and student outcomes.

Professional satisfaction and student outcomes
Changing policies and expectations about the role of teachers have increased the intensity and complexity of teaching and led to a perceived loss of professional status. A number of studies have shown that issues such as mounting accountability, micro-management and centralised control have led to more demanding work environments, emotional exhaustion and stress, and declining motivation, self esteem, health and performance. Teachers have been found to experience ‘moral complexities and ambiguities’ in their work due to frequent shifting in schooling agendas. Student performance is affected by the way teachers approach complexity and the level of support they receive in their efforts.
Declining teacher morale and professional satisfaction is one of the greatest challenges facing school systems. Internationally and nationally, the research reports concerns about the number of retiring education leaders. There is a shortage of qualified and experienced applicants to fill leadership positions. Systems are also experiencing teacher shortages, particularly in specific teaching areas, and in some jurisdictions the gaps are being filled by unqualified teachers. This compromises quality teaching and affects students’ achievements.

Professional status and morale matter. There is a clear association between the motivation and enthusiasm of teachers and student outcomes. Quality teachers were found to be enthusiastic, creative, committed and passionate about their work. Leadership and developmental opportunities were also found to be beneficial to teachers, schools and student outcomes.

The effect of motivation, changing contexts, professional commitment and teacher retention on student performance is an area requiring further research.

**Quality teaching**

The OECD recognises that raising the quality of teaching is an important focus for education and training policy but that teacher quality has many aspects, not captured by indicators such as qualifications, experience and tests of academic ability. The OECD explores research about both the attributes and capabilities and their professional practices.

**Professional practices of quality teachers**

**Selection and implementation of content**

Quality teaching involves content that is rigorous, integrated and relevant. Content of high intellectual quality helps students develop stronger critical and creative thinking capabilities. Students in classes that regularly provided tasks of high intellectual quality showed marked improvement on standardised assessment tasks regardless of their previous achievement levels.

Quality teachers integrate content, tasks and technologies across disciplines making explicit links among subjects and highlighting socially relevant connections. These connections are more powerful when they respect students’ diverse cultural identities. Activities based on intellectual and real-world problems were found to be effective in engaging students. Other effective strategies included integrating multiple tasks and knowledge; using pedagogical scaffolding and feedback; allowing appropriate time for student learning; linking pedagogies to curriculum goals and the needs of individual students; and minimising teaching disruptions.

**Control over curriculum and its design**

In light of current debate about curriculum and assessment across Australia, it is important to note both positive and negative outcomes from centralised curriculum. Some research suggests that centrally mandated curricula are less responsive to local needs and student diversity, offering fewer opportunities for teacher autonomy, creativity and professional engagement. Other studies found that decentralised curriculum can result in stress and work intensification for teachers.

**Knowledge and practice of quality pedagogies**

Research suggests that no single instructional strategy is consistently successful. The most successful teachers are those who are able to use a broad repertoire of approaches skilfully to fit the needs of different students and the demands of different instructional goals, topics, methods and contexts.

Effective teachers use explicit, direct teaching but also give students a substantial role in the reflective creation of knowledge through, for example, the negotiation of learning tasks and student-led questioning. They make transparent the links between student effort and accomplishment.

Quality teaching involves the establishment of quality teaching/learning environments and quality relationships. Such environments and relationships are supportive, inclusive and ‘owned’ by teachers and students. Important features include:

- teachers’ belief in their students’ abilities to learn at high levels regardless of background;
- a sense of safety and belonging;
- optimal use of a variety of grouping structures including cooperative groups, structured peer interactions and heterogeneous groups;
- a welcoming and stimulating environment for family and community members;
- shared control of the learning environment; and
- classroom management practices emphasising and facilitating engaged learning rather than control of students.

Further work is needed on the ways in which different teachers engage with quality pedagogies and how they adapt these in different school contexts.

**Assessment**

Appropriate feedback is powerful in moderating student achievement, and has an impact on students’ concepts of themselves as learners. Feedback should be specific, frequent, positive and responsive to students. Some research indicates that the provision of feedback in the form of comments—rather than in the form of marks—enhances student learning and transfers the responsibility for learning to the students themselves.
Further research is needed to establish how teachers adjust their teaching to take account of the result of micro-level assessment for learning and how this might impact on quality teaching and student outcomes.

**Attributes and capabilities of quality teachers**

Research demonstrates that quality teaching is influenced by individual attributes and capabilities.

**Personal attributes**

Effective teachers are enthusiastic, creative, committed and passionate about their work, and they are good communicators. However, there is a need for more research on the relationship between teachers’ motivation to enter teaching and their commitment, retention and efficacy. This is particularly important with teacher shortages and high staff turnover occurring in challenging school environments.

**Relational attributes and teacher leadership**

Teacher quality improves within a collegial, collaborative environment. Teachers can further their own professional development by observing the strengths of their teaching partners, sharing workloads, reducing duplication, and gaining support in exploring innovation. The need to achieve consensus with colleagues can act as a form of control on teacher autonomy.

Teachers who are leaders within and beyond the classroom can identify with and contribute to a community of teacher learners and leaders, influencing others toward improved educational practice. Such leadership can occur at committee, class, grade and school levels. The opportunity to exercise leadership can also have a positive impact on teachers’ morale, self-esteem, work satisfaction and retention. Teacher leadership can also reduce absenteeism by contribute to student engagement and improved student outcomes.

**Professional attributes and capabilities**

‘Teacher quality’ has been defined as ‘expertise in relevant subject content studies coupled with skills in teaching and learning. Studies of the importance of initial teacher qualifications and certification have shown that well-prepared beginning teachers are more effective than under-certified, unqualified, unprepared recruits. The typical problems of beginning teachers are lessened with adequate preparation prior to entry into the profession and sound induction. Full certification, including a major in the subject taught, positively correlates with student achievement. However, evidence about the most effective form of initial teacher education is inconclusive.

To achieve the best outcomes for students, subject knowledge needs to be integrated with pedagogy. Pedagogical knowledge involves knowing how to organise and present subject matter; how students learn the subject and the worth of available curriculum materials. Quality teachers interpret student behaviour based on this knowledge in order to be responsive, creative and successful in facilitating learning.

**Ongoing professional learning**

Research shows that knowledge about content, learners and pedagogy cannot be achieved through an initial teacher education course on its own and that quality teaching is reliant on ongoing professional development on subject content, teaching, learning, students and education policies.

A disposition toward self-awareness, a willingness to engage in reflective practice and a capacity to be self-judging have been found to be beneficial in teachers’ professional learning. However such reflection has limited benefits if undertaken in isolation. Professional learning based on professional interaction, feedback and cooperation is more valuable. Moreover, professional development needs to be sustained: one-off workshops have limited benefits. Worthwhile professional learning:

- delivers both content and pedagogy;
- is aligned to the school’s vision;
- is focused on student outcomes;
- uses active learning;
- is flexible and teacher-focused;
- is collaborative and continuing; and
- is supported by school leaders.

**Professional standards and certification**

Professional standards are used to establish expectations of what teachers should know, understand and be able to do when they enter the profession, as well as throughout their professional careers. They have been found to impact positively on quality teaching and contribute to ongoing professional learning.

Assessment or certification processes for teachers based on standards have been shown to have positive outcomes although they can also increase teacher workload and frustration.

**School leadership**

Quality school leadership is difficult to define. A recent operational definition is that quality leaders mobilise and work with others to articulate and achieve shared intentions. Quality leadership provides direction, involves a process of influence with intention, and is value-based and vision-driven. While it is common to equate leadership with principals and faculty heads, the research recognises the variety of leadership roles within a school.
Because of the complexity of the relationships, it is impossible to establish a direct link between quality school leadership and student outcomes. However, there is conclusive evidence that principals have a salient but indirect effect on student outcomes through the goals they establish and the quality of the learning environment they foster.

**The leader's role**

The demands placed on school leaders are complex, multi-dimensional and sometimes contradictory. School leaders face competing expectations in their roles as managers, marketers and education leaders. These competing expectations and growing accountabilities have had an impact on the workload and professional satisfaction of school leaders and are seen to have made increasingly hard to recruit quality leaders.

**Professional practices of quality school leadership**

Effective leadership is responsive to context and adaptable in the face of change. There is no particular school leadership model that works in all circumstances. Research depicts school leadership as a process of negotiating dilemmas and shows how effective teachers and principals practise leadership that is contingent, team-based and collegial.

Quality school leaders:

- **set directions** by identifying and articulating a vision that creates high performance expectations;
- **develop people** by offering intellectual stimulation, demonstrating care for their staff and providing individual support;
- **establish collaborative processes** and provide opportunities for teacher-leadership, professional learning, reflection and debate;
- **understand their school's community** and create strong partnerships with stakeholders, including home-school linkages; and
- **value and empower students** by encouraging teachers and the school community to value the social and cultural capital of its students through shared decision-making and support for students as leaders.

**Educational leader or manager?**

In the past few decades principals have had to spend an increasing proportion of their time on managerial responsibilities and accountability. There is agreement in the research that management and administration are core responsibilities of successful school leaders, necessary to ensure the smooth operation of a school.

It is educational leadership that is central to the improvement of students' social and academic outcomes. Effective school leaders are committed to improving the quality of teaching, encouraging and equipping staff to focus on student learning outcomes. The school principal does not necessarily have to be an exemplary teacher, but should ensure that the school's main focus is an educative one.

**Leadership strategies**

The report identifies and describes different leadership strategies employed by school leaders and cites research evidence about their effectiveness. The strategies include:

- **Instructional, pedagogical or educative leadership**, where leaders assume responsibility for the professional development of teachers, the learning outcomes of students and the deployment of resources to realise these goals;
- **Managerial leadership**, where leaders manage the key functions and tasks of schools in the same way as profit-making businesses are operated;
- **Transductive or transactional leadership**, where the leader and follower achieve interdependent goals through a traditional 'effort for rewards' relationship;
- **Transformational leadership**, which relies on the vision and charisma of the leader in the pursuit of higher-level common goals;
- **Interpersonal or emotional leadership**, which places high value on the quality of relationships;
- **Moral leadership** which focuses on values and beliefs to give a sense of purpose to the school; and
- **Contingent or contextual leadership** which employs a range of leadership strategies and styles depending on the issues at hand, context and the stage of school development.

**Leadership organisation**

Effective school leadership is organised in a variety of ways:

- **Strategic leadership**, where school leaders operate strategically in the interest of the long term sustainability and effectiveness of the organisation;
- **Distributive, participative or democratic leadership**, where leadership is distributed across people in the organisation;
- **Parallel leadership**, where principals assume responsibility for strategic leadership and teachers have primary responsibility for instructional leadership; and
- **Co-principalship or 'shared principalships'**, where two individuals share the principal's role.
Promoting schools as learning organisations

Effective school leaders have expertise in building school and community capacity and collegiality. They work with and through teachers, parents and community members to develop systems and structures that promote the school as a learning organisation and improve student outcomes. Transformational and distributive leadership are effective in facilitating organisational learning.

Effective school leaders benefit from collaboration with a focus on developing the intellectual or cultural capital of their school, in the form of professional dialogue within and outside the school, staff professional development, peer networking and knowledge sharing. School leaders have been positive about the benefits of mentoring and opportunities to visit schools where they could see research-based theories in action.

Vision or mission

It is increasingly an expectation of parents and the wider community that a school has a vision or mission. A vision sets out directions for the school, drawing people together around common purposes and goals and engendering confidence and enthusiasm amongst stakeholders. Although defined as part of core leadership practice, vision-building is a highly sophisticated, dynamic process that few organisations sustain. Visions typically reflect the core values and beliefs of the formal leader, but need to be derived from the values and beliefs of all stakeholders.

Attributes and capabilities of effective leaders

Successful school leaders possess a range of personal, relational, organisational and professional attributes, plus the capacity to employ these effectively in complex and changing circumstances. It is not clear to what extent the practices, attributes and capabilities of quality school leaders can be learned, particularly given the strong value-base of many of these attributes, such as caring, innate goodness, fairness, consideration for others and honesty. On the other hand, qualities such as being a good communicator, having an inclusive style with high expectations, being hands-on and being a good decision-maker are skill-based attributes that might be more readily learned.

The personal attributes of effective school leaders include passion and commitment (particularly a desire for students’ success), and a capacity for personal reflection. Values of social justice and equity usually underpin the passion, enthusiasm, persistence and optimism of successful leaders.

The relational attributes and capabilities of effective leaders include:

• professional support and mentorship of staff. Effective leaders use a range of strategies to encourage teachers’ efforts in innovative thinking, investing in staff development and mentoring;
• relational trust. Effective school leaders have a trusting disposition and can model and develop trust within the school community;
• emotional intelligence. This includes capabilities such as calmness, sense of humour, perspective, resilience, ability to make difficult decisions, conflict resolution skills and the ability to listen and contribute to the work of a team; and
• interpersonal care and integrity. Effective school leaders respect others, have good interpersonal skills and communicate well. They value and practise personal relationship skills, they know their staff’s potential and support them in achieving their goals and in times of adversity.

Effective leaders also possess critical organisational capabilities. These include:

• effective management skills. Management skills and knowledge are essential to maintaining clear directions, systems, expectations and roles that support development and understanding by all stakeholders;
• contextual awareness. Effective leaders understand the local school community and the broader economic, political and policy contexts. They are also well networked, knowing where to source external support and resources, and are able to balance competing priorities, decide directions and use strategies that maintain positive relationships with their school communities;
• strategic thinking. Effective leaders balance contextual pressures for change with core school values and vision when deciding their actions, keeping the school’s long term effectiveness and sustainability in view.
• problem solving. Strong leaders take calculated, legitimate risks and encourage others to do so in solving problems. Research suggests that problem solving and conflict resolution skills using analytical thinking can be learned, particularly through shared experiential learning; and
• harnessing change. Successful school leaders positively manage change to achieve the school’s longer term goals, and maintain staff and student morale during challenging times. They accept their responsibility for student learning outcomes while maintaining a commitment to broader goals for education.

The role of leadership standards

Research shows that leadership strategies can be learned, albeit not in single off-the-job courses, but rather through more active, enduring means such as coaching, mentoring, networking, interschool visits and reflective portfolios. Standards frameworks for leadership can be used to:
• clarify expectations;
• offer guidance to improving practice;
• provide a basis for professional learning;
• promote the profession;
• underpin performance evaluation systems; and
• assist in the recruitment, selection and credentialing of principals.

There is considerable variability between existing leadership standards frameworks in their coverage of the full range of leadership practices. There is also a lack of research evidence of the impact of leadership standards.

Areas for further research in quality teaching and school leadership

The synthesis of research literature and nationwide consultations with representatives of the profession have identified a number of areas for further research:

• Understanding the context and impact of quality teaching and school leadership:
  o how different contexts influence the capacity of teachers and school leaders to work effectively;
  o how skills and knowledge are transferred between contexts;
  o how diverse groups of teachers engage with pedagogy;
  o centralised versus school-based curriculum;
  o interaction between the use of multiple technologies and quality teaching;
  o impact of teaching on non-academic student outcomes (eg social, cognitive, physical and emotional capabilities);
  o how effective leadership influences teaching and learning; and
  o teacher-leaders and students-as-leaders.

• Determining and nurturing attributes and capabilities for quality teaching and school leadership:
  o the personal, relational and organisational attributes and capabilities of effective teachers and school leaders; and
  o the qualifications needed to build an effective teacher and leader.

• Determining and communicating the professional practices of quality teachers and school leaders:
  o understanding the professional practices of school leaders independently of the categories of leadership styles; and
  o collaborative leadership among principals and teachers.

• Attracting and sustaining quality teachers and school leaders:
  o how effective principals and teachers avoid burn-out;
  o the effectiveness of programs such as mentoring, coaching and work-shadowing in supporting quality teachers and leaders;
  o how to best reward effective teachers and keep them in the classroom; and
  o the impact of professional learning on collaboration, leadership and knowledge transfer.

• The role of professional standards in quality teaching and school leadership:
  o how professional standards impact on student outcomes and how they should be used; and
  o the content of professional standards.

Database for enhancing teaching and school leadership

It is important to identify not only the data needed by classroom practitioners and school and system leaders, but also how best to engage educators and policy makers in collecting, using and sharing evidence to improve teaching practice and student outcomes.

A useful and effective database for the teaching profession would need to create an online environment that engages teachers and school leaders in regular interaction. Its content should include access to relevant information about policy and research, links to existing resources, exemplars of best practice, direct support for professionals (eg an “ask an expert” service) and access to professional development through self-assessment schedules and online courses. It could also provide a forum for teachers to exchange the results of action research and a stimulus for debate and innovation.
1.1 Background
The teaching profession has an immense responsibility, and much hope is placed on quality teaching and school leadership for the future of Australian students, citizens and workers. This review seeks to provide a synthesis of research on what is known about ‘quality’ as it is applied to teaching and school leadership, in order to enhance competence and open ways to improvement amongst the teaching profession.

This report provides support for effective and strong school leaders, irrespective of whether they are teachers or principals. It attempts to document a body of research identifying the factors influencing quality teaching and school leadership and, as such, can be used to support and advance the teaching profession if used as a base or frame for professional development activities. Further, through identifying gaps in existing knowledge the report also indicates areas concerning quality teaching and school leadership in which further research should be undertaken. This first chapter provides an overview of the conceptual framework used to organise this report and a brief account of the project’s method.

1.2 What is ‘quality’?
What is meant by this ambiguous and complex term—quality teaching and school leadership? This project made no attempt to pre-emptively define quality with respect to teaching and school leadership, but rather explored what the research literature had to say. In much of the literature, quality teaching and school leadership is identified as a set of professional attributes and practices that have an influence on student outcomes and the school community. Quality teaching and school leadership involves more than the present, the here-and-now of the classroom; it extends to relations between schooling and society, lessons from the past and anticipation of the future. Contrary to the arguments of some, quality teaching and school leadership does not involve inexplicable ‘talents’ or ‘instincts.’ Nor is it a matter of teachers and other school leaders applying a pre-determined set of methods in the hope that quality education and training will follow. Rather, quality involves giving serious attention to, and making decisions about, an array of interacting factors that ultimately influence student and school outcomes. Across the literature it is clear that decisions quality teachers and leaders make about their context and the actions they take bring improvements to the outcomes and future capabilities of their students.

1.3 A conceptual framework for quality teaching and school leadership
Quality teaching and school leadership is a complex, many-faceted phenomenon. It is not static; it comprises vital, dynamic processes operating in changing contexts in education and society. Quality teaching and school leadership are both shaped by, and in turn seek to shape, an array of contextual factors associated with schools and schooling. Therefore to understand quality teaching and school leadership it is necessary to understand how:

- contextual factors influence the dynamics of schools and school processes—and how quality teachers and school leaders act thoughtfully and tactfully in engaging with and responding to these contextual factors—in order to enhance students’ learning outcomes;
- professional practices influence students’ learning outcomes, attributes and capabilities of teachers and school leaders influence students’ learning outcomes.

Drawing on these analyses, the research on both quality teaching and quality school leadership in the following two chapters has been organised around three interrelated domains (represented by spheres in figure 1.1), namely:

- contextual factors;
- professional practices; and
- attributes and capabilities.

Figure 1.1: Domains of quality teaching and school leadership
**Contextual factors** refers to the socio-cultural domain that forms and informs the work of teachers and school leaders, and in turn influences them through their work. Teachers and school leaders form and inform the understandings of the Australian public, especially its students, and in doing so they reproduce or otherwise develop these understandings.

**Professional practices** include the knowledge, skills and practices that teachers and leaders find most useful in meeting the needs of their students, and Australian society’s needs for new generations of educated citizens and workers. Teachers and school leaders not only learn or otherwise acquire these skills and knowledge, but also contribute to their production.

**Attributes and capabilities** are the personal, relational and professional attributes of teachers and leaders relevant to the pursuit of a career in the teaching profession.

The research literature clearly indicates that quality teaching and school leadership involves a dynamic interplay amongst these domains. The local school context, and the wider socio-economic and policy context, play a powerful role in shaping the structures, opportunities and dynamics of quality teaching and school leadership in Australia. It is difficult to fully understand the problems of improving students’ learning outcomes without taking into account the ways the intersections of these dynamics relate to and frame quality teaching and school leadership.

It should not be thought that the relationship between these domains is static or that they are without tensions and dilemmas. The operation of these three domains (contextual factors, professional practices and attributes and capabilities) at the level of the daily practices of teachers and leaders is complicated and proceeds at different rates.

There are four key reasons for this complexity, each of which interacts with the others in uneven ways. First, teachers, including school leaders, have differential access to the range of resources needed to enhance their quality. Second, their work is mediated by socio-economic demands on their work including the types of citizens and workers they are expected to prepare. Third, institutional structures in which teachers and school leaders work generate differing measures of quality. Fourth, Australia’s educational cultures form and inform the terms under which quality teaching and school leadership are identified and given meaning. The intersection of these relations with the context, professional practices, attributes and capabilities of school leaders adds to this complexity. These factors can lead to augmentations or diminutions as well as interruptions or continuities in quality.

### 1.4 Project methodology

There are three main techniques used to review research, namely narrative review, meta-analysis and best-evidence synthesis (Hart, 1998). This project used the latter to review Australian and international research generated over the past five years. This method involved identifying, collecting, reviewing, interpreting and drawing empirically grounded, theoretically informed conclusions from each study and synthesising the results. The goals of this method were to understand what knowledge researchers have been able to establish about quality teaching and school leadership, to evaluate their knowledge claims, and to synthesise these studies in ways that demonstrate their interrelatedness (Hodder, 2000). Criteria for the inclusion of research in this review and the synthesis of the literature (Marzano, 1998) were:

- a focus on issues of ‘quality teaching and school leadership’, especially as it relates to:
  - professional standards and accreditation;
  - professional learning and course accreditation;
  - research and communication; and
  - promotion of the profession;
- presentation as a research study, or review of research;
- publication in scholarly books and/or peer reviewed research published in national and internationally refereed journals;
- publication within the last six years (dated 1999+);
- research reports from education authorities and professional organisations;
- frequently cited seminal works; and
- ‘fugitive’ quality research produced by the profession itself.

Consultations with key education authorities and professional education organisations across Australia enabled the project team to test the initial findings on quality teaching and school leadership derived from a preliminary review of the research literature. Following these state-based consultations further research was identified, analysed and incorporated into the review and synthesis. The database proposal provided in this report, (see chapter 5), was also derived from the consultation process. A consistent series of questions was posed at each consultation session, exploring the notion of a quality teaching and school leadership database. Responses were collated and analysed for consistency and saliency to inform the proposal. Regular consultations with Teaching Australia via face-to-face meetings, teleconferences, electronic mail and submission of progress reports, were used to frame and refine this final report.
The majority of the research reviewed in this report has been conducted in the USA, the United Kingdom or Canada: a limitation of the research was the necessity for the studies reviewed to be reported in English. Interestingly, the research in Australia that has been undertaken is largely state-based rather than nationwide. In addition, the amount of research in particular areas may reflect past research emphases and paradigms. For example, the proliferation of studies of attributes and capabilities of both teachers and school leaders seems to reflect a popular research approach at one time. Recent research tends to involve more complex research designs, investigating the intricacies of quality teaching and leadership, and incorporating methodology that captures quality teachers in action.

The research reviewed in this report showed a predominance of case studies and short-term studies. It also tended to focus on describing those teachers and school leaders in schools that have been identified as making a difference to students’ social and academic outcomes. Despite these limitations within the research, this review still provides fundamental ideas and empirical evidence about quality teaching and school leadership. It helps to identify the education community working together in this important area, and demonstrates just how complex quality teaching and school leadership are.

1.5 Report organisation

Chapter 2 of this report provides an account of the research on quality teaching whilst Chapter 3 presents the review of research on school leadership. Findings in both these chapters have been organised primarily in the three domains of:

- contextual factors;
- professional practices; and
- attributes and capabilities.

Areas for further research relating to quality teaching and school leadership were identified during the review and through consultations with the profession. These gaps and areas for research are reported in Chapter 4. The final chapter, Chapter 5, presents a proposal for a database that might be used to enhance the teaching profession, drawing on the contributions made by the profession during the consultation phase of the project.
Most research literature defines ‘quality teaching’ indirectly, either through its impact on student outcomes (ie quality teaching is teaching that has a positive impact on student outcomes), or through the presence of professional attributes (skills, knowledge, qualifications, professional development). Three domains of quality teaching are explored in the following synthesis of recent research:

- the teaching context and its relationship with quality teaching and student outcomes;
- links between professional practices and quality teaching and student outcomes;
- associations between quality teaching and teacher attributes and capabilities, including teachers’ qualifications.

### 2.1 What is ‘quality teaching’?

What counts as ‘quality teaching’ and ‘quality teachers’ varies amongst different stakeholders and across research projects. In some cases, ‘quality teaching’ is operationally defined as teaching that produces an improvement in student outcomes. Another approach holds that ‘quality’ in any professional practice can be defined as possessing expert knowledge of the particular field—a deep understanding of its underlying principles, accumulated experience in the practice of the profession, a familiarity with recent advances in professional knowledge, and a mastery of the best available techniques and tools (Masters, 2003). Is this what counts as ‘quality’ in the teaching profession? This chapter takes a broad perspective on ‘quality’ and its synonyms and provides a synthesis of a wide range of recent research.

### 2.2 The relationship between quality teaching and student outcomes

Quality teaching has a measurable impact on students’ cognitive, affective and behavioural outcomes (Alton-Lee, 2003; Laczko-Kerr & Berliner, 2002; Masters, 2003; Wenglinsky, 2002), ranging in the studies from 30% (Hattie, 2003) to 59% (Alton-Lee, 2003). Conversely, there is evidence that the impact of poor quality teaching on student outcomes can be debilitating and cumulative: students assigned to several ineffective teachers in succession have significantly lower achievement and reduced gains in achievement compared with those assigned to several highly effective teachers in sequence (Darling-Hammond, 2000).

Some research assigns teachers almost exclusive responsibility for student learning outcomes. For instance, Rowe (2003) asserts that:

> The quality of teaching and learning provision is by far the most salient influence on students’ cognitive, affective, and behavioural outcomes of schooling—regardless of their gender or backgrounds. Indeed, findings from the related local and international evidence-based research indicate ‘what matters most’ is quality teachers and teaching, supported by strategic teacher professional development. (p.15).

However, while quality teaching is reported as important in shaping students’ social and academic developments, it is misleading to assign it exclusive salience in the educational process. The OECD notes that students’ social and academic performances, and public concern about teacher quality, are both shaped by a complex and interacting array of societal, systemic and scholastic factors that include socio-economic changes, reforms to the education system and changing expectations of schools.

Teacher policy concerns have intensified in recent years due to the profound economic and social changes underway and the imperatives for schools to provide the foundations for lifelong learning. All school systems have been engaged in major curriculum reforms and have placed stronger emphases on gender equality within schools, the incorporation of information and communication technology, and greater integration of students with special needs. Such developments require re-examination of the role of teachers, their preparation, work and careers. A key challenge is to understand the complex range of factors—societal, school system level, and school level—that are giving rise to teacher policy concerns (OECD, 2005).

The OECD (2005) reports that raising the quality of teaching provides an important focus for legislation and policies directed at education and training reforms for the future. These policies often focus on professional qualifications and competencies, but the OECD recognises that:

> [while] research indicates that raising teacher quality is perhaps the policy direction most likely to lead to substantial gains in school performance... there are many important aspects of teacher quality that are not captured by indicators such as qualifications, experience and tests of academic ability (OECD, 2005).

### 2.3 The domains of quality teaching

The findings from research have been categorised into three domains (fig 2.1). These are the teaching context and its relationship with quality teaching and student outcomes; links between professional practices and quality teaching; and associations between quality teaching and teacher attributes and capabilities, including teachers’ qualifications and career recognitions.

![Figure 2.1: Quality teaching domains](image-url)
2.4 Contextual factors influencing quality teaching

Changes in the social, technical, political, economic and cultural contexts of schools and schooling influence, but do not decisively determine, the work of teachers and the quality of teaching. This includes elements of school management and decision making. Quality teaching includes the ability of teachers to anticipate and respond to change and to build alliances with key influencers including parents and caregivers. It also includes the ability to accommodate the increasing diversity of the student population. Across the research a range of contextual factors were identified as influences on quality teaching (fig. 2.2). These included:

- changing societal expectations and times;
- diverse student communities; and
- school environment and management.

These changing times have transformed the context in which teachers work. Transformations are also occurring in expectations about the knowledge and skills that teachers need to exhibit (ACDE, 2004), the roles they are required to undertake, and the ways in which they are to work (OECD, 2005). Teachers prepare students for the future through the actions they take in the present. In this context of change, teachers are increasingly expected to develop students’ skills, knowledge and understandings for an uncertain world 10-12 years ahead, and to provide the groundwork for life-long learning for an unknowable future (Boyd, 2000).

Technological change

Teachers are expected to work with ever-advancing information and communication technologies, and to do so flexibly, autonomously and often in a self-directed manner. Evidence indicates that embracing new technologies has made teachers’ work more complex and intense (Blackmore, 2004). In addition to their work as information or knowledge providers, they now work as facilitators for accessing information and as stimulators of knowledge production. Olson, James and Lang (1999) reported that the use of information and communication technologies (ICT) can have negative impacts on teachers, their work and their students. ICTs demand time to assess the suitability of internet sources, new forms of teaching to be developed and a balance to be created between theory and practical skills. Reports testify that teachers need considerable support to develop pedagogic knowledge and skills to productively engage with new technologies, as well as with their students in a new generation of learning experiences (Law, 2003).

Policy/political changes with consequences for teacher values, workloads and morale

National level research in several countries has shown political and policy changes can impact negatively on teachers, as well as on students and schools (although the latter is reported less often). For example Myrick (2004) found teachers reported moral complexities and ambiguities in their role as a result of political and policy changes. They had considered schooling as a means for fostering students’ desires for right conduct, a good life and self-reflection. As schools became sites of knowledge creation, the agenda shifted to focusing on generating knowledge to further economic growth and public policy. Myrick’s findings indicated that the way teachers addressed the interface between these complexities, how well they did so, and how they were supported in doing so, affected how well students fared during the course of their schooling. (See also section 2.5.2.)

A number of studies have investigated the impact of changing pay and conditions such as outsourcing, employment of temporary workers, organisational restructuring and downsizing. These studies have found:
negative impacts on the professional identity of teachers (Stronach, Corbin, McNamara, Stark & Warne, 2002) including limited personal accomplishment and loss of meaningfulness in teachers’ work (Kittel & Leynen, 2003);

• deterioration in occupational health and safety and well-being, burn-out and emotional exhaustion (Aronsson, Gustafsson & Dallner, 2002; Hellgren, Sverke & Isaksson, 1999; Kittel & Leynen, 2003; Quinlan, Mayhew & Bohle, 2001);

• increased hours of work, work complexity and intensity, and less job security (Aronsson, Gustafsson & Dallner, 2002; Kittel & Leynen, 2003; Johnson & Landman, 2000; Malloy & Wohlstetter, 2003; Roulston, 2004);

• teacher dissatisfaction (Johnson & Landman, 2000); and

• reduced organisational performance (Hellgren, Sverke & Isaksson, 1999; Storey, 2000).

Increasing teacher accountability for student success or failure has also been found to have a considerable effect on the work of teachers and the school experiences of students in both England and New Zealand (Thrupp, 1998). Micro-management of ever-tightening regulations and controls can be the antithesis of teacher professionalism; and negative results of accountability for teachers can include decrease in their motivation, self-esteem, performance and health (Kleinhenz & Ingvarson, 2004).

Together, this research suggests that these types of efforts to re-shape teachers’ work and workplace arrangements have a negative impact upon the lives and work of teachers through the creation of high job demands, emotional exhaustion and stress. Further research is needed to establish how these types of changes to teachers’ work affect the quality of their teaching and students’ learning outcomes, particularly in Australian contexts.

Alignment of parent/teacher expectations

Studies of parent and community expectations have found that parents and caregivers value the contributions that teachers make to students’ lives. However, the research literature indicates that parent, caregiver; and broader community expectations about the performance of schools are rising (Clancy, 2005). This is partly a result of an assumption that successful education is partly a result of an assumption that successful education promotes the creation of high job demands, emotional exhaustion and stress. Further research is needed to establish how these types of changes to teachers’ work affect the quality of their teaching and students’ learning outcomes, particularly in Australian contexts.

An important area of alignment/difference between parents and teachers is the value of homework as a link between home and school. Lawson, Ey, & Smajlagic, 2006 found that home-school congruence is important, especially as students need to engage outside school with information and communication technologies as well as with books. While some parents/care-givers viewed homework as an additional source of pressure and family anxiety, positive impacts occurred when teachers were able to construct and provide feedback on homework tasks that supported in-class learning and did not unnecessarily fatigue and frustrate students. This research suggests possibilities for national initiatives that promote renewed partnerships between schools and parents/caregivers around school learning.

2.4.2 Diverse student communities

There is general agreement in the research literature that the increasingly diverse range of students enrolling in schools adds to the complexities of quality teaching. The presence of special needs students as well as changes to Government policies surrounding participation and retention of young people in learning, immigration, and youth unemployment has played a significant part in changing student demographics.

Research findings show that students’ age, gender and cultural backgrounds interact significantly with teaching practices and students’ learning outcomes (Hill & Russell, 1999). In addition to different gender, ethnic, cultural, linguistic and socio-economic status (SES) backgrounds, students are recognised as having different modes of learning or multiple-intelligences (Gardner, 1993; 1999) and motivations (Martin, 2003).
Teachers are expected to employ strategies to cater for the diverse qualities of students and to enhance the scholastic achievement of all (ACDE, 2004; Clancy, 2005; Hargreaves, 2000). Alton-Lee’s (2003) meta-analysis of research on teaching quality reported that teaching which was responsive to student diversity (ethnicity, socio-economic background, home language, gender, special needs, disability and giftedness) had a positive impact on both low and high achievers.

**Age**

Students in the middle school years, in particular, are considered vulnerable as reading levels plateau or decline from Years 5-8. In these years, there is also a higher level of underachievement particularly amongst boys, and a marked decline in enjoyment of schooling (Hill & Russell, 1999).

**Poverty and ethnicity**

Quicke (2000) reported that a crucial limitation in the school improvement and school effectiveness research has been inadequate appreciation of the cultural diversity within schools. Based on an extensive meta-analysis of research on student achievement, as well as analysis of US policies in 50 states and student achievement scores in reading and mathematics, Darling-Hammond (2000b) found that student characteristics such as poverty, non-English speaking background and ethnicity were negatively correlated with student outcomes. The quality of teaching, however, was shown to mediate the extent of influence of these demographic characteristics.

**Gender: teachers and students**

Similarly, Rowe’s (2000) school effectiveness research showed that the contribution of student and teacher gender was relatively insignificant when compared with teacher effects. Whilst boys’ literacy skills, academic achievements, attitudes, behaviours and experiences of schooling were significantly poorer than those of girls, the quality of teaching and learning in literacy and related areas of verbal learning (eg reasoning and written communication skills) had a more salient influence on students’ cognitive, affective and behavioural outcomes, than the gender of the students.

Lahelma (2000) contrasted teachers’ and young people’s perspectives on male and female teachers. Gender did not appear relevant when the students talked about teachers. They appreciated teachers who could teach, were friendly, relaxed, and able to maintain order and make students work. This was irrespective of gender. The study suggests that students need quality teachers – not necessarily male teachers to act as ‘male role models’. Similarly, Mills, Martino and Lingard (2004) analysed a Queensland education policy concerned with the attraction, recruitment and retention of male teachers, and found that it fails to take into account complex matters of gender and masculinities, especially the limitations of male teachers as role models for boys.

**2.4.3 School environment and management**

Issues to do with the school environment and the management of its vision, policies, practices and decision-making also affect quality teaching. Rowe’s (2003) meta-analysis of selected studies found that school factors such as financial and material resources, class size, teacher qualifications, class-based organisation and teaching methods reportedly had minimal effects on students’ achievements. However, as discussed below, other research provides evidence that a school’s educative focus, strategic vision, teacher qualifications, school and class size, social and cultural inclusion all impact on teacher quality and student outcomes.

**Educative focus**

An educative focus occurs when teaching, learning and the achievement of all students are prioritised as core functions of the school, and includes high levels of teacher expectations, pace of learning and time available for learning. Schools that have an educative (rather than an administrative or managerial) focus at their core have been shown to implement more effective curricula (Fouts, 2003). Fouts’ synthesis of studies of classroom practices in the state of Washington (USA) identified that the achievement of learners was raised when schools maintained an educative focus in which teachers established and followed through on high expectations for learning outcomes and maintained appropriate pace in teaching for learning to proceed. However, while high expectations were necessary, they were not sufficient and could be counterproductive when not supported by quality pedagogies (Alton-Lee, 2003).

**Class size effects**

Class sizes of fewer than 20 students, when accompanied by appropriate adaptations to instruction, have led to increases in student achievement, especially in the early primary years and with students from low-SES backgrounds (Nye, Hedges & Konstantopoulos, 1999). Appropriate instruction in small classes has also been shown to lead to greater student engagement; reduced grade retention, reduced dropout rates in secondary schools, and increased academic aspirations among students (Finn, 2002). Further, the advantages realised by smaller classes have been reported to be maintained in subsequent years (Biddle & Berliner, 2002).
Explanations for small class size effects included improved teacher morale, fewer disruptions, more teacher time spent on individual instruction, and less time occupied by classroom management or discipline (Leithwood & Riehl, 2003). The OECD (2005) reported:

The quality of teaching is determined not just by the 'quality' of the teachers ... but also by the environment in which they work. Able teachers are not necessarily going to reach their potential in settings that do not provide appropriate support or sufficient challenge and reward (p. 7).

Other key school features identified in the research literature that facilitate quality teaching and improve student outcomes included:

- school vision, ethos and commitment to a whole school community learning focus (Alton-Lee, 2003; Barnett & McCormack, 2002; Chapman, 2002; Eaker, DuFour & Burnette, 2002; Fair Go Team, 2006; Harris & Muijs, nd; Holden, 2002; Leithwood & Riehl, 2003; Potter; Reynolds & Chapman, 2002; Holden, 2002; Quicke, 2000);
- smaller school size and socially and culturally inclusive school environments (Alton-Lee, 2003; Fouts, 2003; NSW Department of Education & Training, 2003; Hayes, Lingard, & Mills, 2000; Leithwood & Riehl, 2003; Stone & Alfie, 2004);
- strategic resourcing and organisation (ACDE, 2004; Betts, Reuben & Danenberg, 2000; Blackmore, 2004; Darling-Hammond, 2000b; Goe, 2002; Hargreaves, 2000; Sinclair & Perre, 2001; Skilbeck, 2003; Woodward & Sinclair, 2005); and

2.5 Professional practices of quality teaching

Quality teaching is contextual and flexible. Its content is connected to students’ lives and is of high intellectual quality. Quality teachers employ a range of teaching and meta-cognitive learning strategies that fit the needs of diverse students and the demands of different instructional goals, topics and methods.

According to the research literature a range of professional practice factors influence quality teaching. The research findings presented in this section can be grouped around three professional practice factors (fig. 2.3):

- Selection of content (knowledge);
- Control over the curriculum and its design; and
- Knowledge and practice of quality pedagogies.

The research literature indicates that rigour and relevance in the selection of curriculum content influence and are influenced by quality teaching. Quality teaching has been found to involve the use of content which is of high intellectual quality, integrated from a variety of knowledge disciplines, connected to students’ prior knowledge and relevant to students’ lives (Alton-Lee, 2003; NSW Department of Education & Training, 2003; Hayes, Lingard & Mills, 2000; QSRLS, 2001). American and Australian studies show positive relationships between content with these characteristics and enhanced student outcomes (Fair Go Team, 2006; Fouts, 2003; Hayes, Lingard & Mills, 2000; Hayes, Mills, Christie, & Lingard, 2005; Newmann & Associates, 1996; Rowan, Camburn & Correnti, 2004).

Intellectual quality

Data from detailed observations of more than 900 classroom lessons and questionnaires and interviews with senior teachers in the Queensland School Reform Longitudinal Study (QSRLS) showed that curricula with high intellectual quality are significant in developing students’ higher-order critical and creative thinking capabilities (QSRLS, 2001). It deepened students’ knowledge and extended their understandings, aiding their self-regulation of learning and increasing their substantive conversations about the topic and their learning processes. Newmann, Bryk and Nagaoka’s (2001) analysis of reform in Chicago schools found that all students, regardless of previous achievement levels, showed enhanced achievement on standardised assessment tasks when they were in classes that regularly provided tasks of high intellectual quality. Similarly, the Fair Go Team’s (2006) qualitative research in 10 low-SES schools in south western Sydney found that students reported school as more interesting and relevant to their future lives when the work they did had enhanced intellectual quality.
Relevance to student knowledge and cultural identity

Quality teaching employs content that recognises differences amongst students and is responsive to their diversity (Fouts, 2003). Evidence showed that quality teachers had knowledge of the characteristics of their students and made their teaching responsive to students (NSW Department of Education & Training, 2003). In such classes, diverse cultural knowledges were recognised and brought into play, with deliberate attempts being made to increase the participation of students of different backgrounds. The educational relevance of this knowledge was made transparent to students, just as the cultural practices of the school were made explicit and taught. Ways of taking and making meaning of texts, discourses, numbers or experiences were made evident (Teasdale, 1997). These culturally appropriate content choices and quality teaching practices respected and affirmed the students’ cultural identities, including their gender, and so optimised educational opportunities for them. Students’ prior experiences and knowledge were recognised and built upon with new information that was linked to their experiential knowledge (Alton-Lee, 2003; Hayes, Lingard & Mills, 2000).

2.5.2 Control over the curriculum and its design

The research literature indicates that there are unresolved issues over centralised versus decentralised curriculum, but points to the importance of effective design and implementation of curricula as well as to the value of an educative focus, rather than managerial focus, for affecting quality teaching and student outcomes.

Centralised and decentralised curriculum

The control, design and implementation of curriculum have all been shown to affect quality teaching and student outcomes, however studies have reported both positive and negative outcomes of centralised curriculum. Webb, Vulliamy, Hamalainen, Sarja, Kimoneen & Nevalainen’s (2004) comparative studies of curricula in England and Finland found that the centrally controlled, compulsory national curriculum of the United Kingdom led to improvements in the practice of teachers, and the enhancement of teaching professionalism. In contrast, studies in the USA, Australia and Canada have reported a number of negative impacts of centralised curricula on teachers and quality teaching including:

- teacher anxiety, frustration and reduced self-efficacy (Cochran-Smith, Dudley & Marling, 2001; Leithwood, Steinbach & Jantzi, 2002);
- the undermining of respect for teachers (Blackmore, 2004; Groundwater-Smith & Sachs 2002; Webb et al, 2004);
- the loss of opportunities to be creative and generate ideas to motivate and interest students (Webb et al 2004); and
- a narrowed and ‘dumbed down’ curriculum (Cochran-Smith & Dudley-Manning, 2001; Luke, 2004; Webb et al, 2004) in which there is a reduced range of content and of cognitive level in the activities designed for students.

The narrow, ‘dumbed down’ curriculum was especially a problem for minority students for whom English literature and higher-order thinking skills were sometimes abandoned in favour of test-driven skills (Cochran-Smith & Dudley-Manning, 2001). Further, in one Australian state, basic skills testing and accountability measures were reported as ‘shaving off’ the teaching of critical and creative thinking, lowering cognitive demands and limiting intellectual depth (Luke, 2004).

Some studies suggest that decentralised curriculum improves teachers’ ability to be creative and to respond to student characteristics. Wijesundera’s (2002) study of a decentralised curriculum showed that it was linked with enhanced student learning outcomes because decentralisation had enabled the curriculum to be adapted to local student needs. However, the negative effects of a decentralised approach to curriculum control and design have also been reported in the research literature. Hargreaves (2000), Leithwood, Steinbach & Jantzi (2002) and Webb et al (2004) reported that centralised curriculum led to work intensification for teachers weighed down by ever-burgeoning reform demands; and isolation as the range and autonomy of their classroom judgements were reduced, lessening the need for collaborative planning. In contrast, Blackmore (2004) reported work intensification and stress for teachers and principals from decentralisation. Other concerns included feelings of inadequacy, inability to cope in classes, loss of confidence and lowered self-concept amongst teachers (Webb et al. 2004). This dilemma about how to proceed with decentralised and centralised curriculum planning and implementation requires further study.

Effective design and implementation of curricula

Studies of effective design and implementation of curricula have found positive effects for both teachers and students. Teacher effects recorded in the literature included enhanced instructional purpose, goals and pedagogies in the teaching process (Alton-Lee, 2003). Student effects included increases in students’ motivation, on-task engagement, development of information skills, improved critical and creative thinking, and reductions in the drop-out rates among lower-ability high school students (Stone & Alfeld, 2004). The reported features of effective curriculum design and implementation included:
coherence, interconnectedness and links to real life (Alton-Lee, 2003; Fouts, 2003; NSW Department of Education & Training, 2003; Hayes, Lingard & Mills, 2000; Stone & Alfeld, 2004). Problem-based curriculum has been shown to benefit students by enabling them to identify and solve intellectual and real world problems (Bishop, 2003; Hayes, Lingard & Mills, 2000; Stone & Alfeld, 2004). Problem-based curriculum has been shown to benefit students by enabling them to identify and solve intellectual and real world problems (Bishop, 2003; Hayes, Lingard & Mills, 2000; Stone & Alfeld, 2004). Problem-based curriculum has been shown to benefit students by enabling them to identify and solve intellectual and real world problems (Bishop, 2003; Hayes, Lingard & Mills, 2000; Stone & Alfeld, 2004). Problem-based curriculum has been shown to benefit students by enabling them to identify and solve intellectual and real world problems (Bishop, 2003; Hayes, Lingard & Mills, 2000; Stone & Alfeld, 2004). Problem-based curriculum has been shown to benefit students by enabling them to identify and solve intellectual and real world problems (Bishop, 2003; Hayes, Lingard & Mills, 2000; Stone & Alfeld, 2004).

- content that addressed diversity appropriately and effectively engages diverse sources of knowledge represented by the diversity of students, and made use of intellectual resources that incorporated appropriate oral and written texts across the curriculum (Alton-Lee, 2003);
- task design in which multiple tasks were used to support learning, and where teaching strategies matched the developmental learning needs of students (Alton-Lee, 2003), with ‘hands on and minds on’ experiences being used (Stone & Alfeld, 2004);
- pedagogical scaffolding and appropriate feedback were provided (Alton-Lee, 2003; Black & Harrison, 2001; Fouts, 2003);
- the pedagogical strategies were related to curricular goals (Alton-Lee, 2003; NSW Department of Education & Training; Hayes, Lingard & Mills, 2000; Hill & Russell, 1999); the ICT usage was integrated into teaching practices across the curriculum (Alton-Lee, 2003; Hill & Russell, 1999); and appropriate periods of time were allocated to student learning, minimising disruptions to quality teaching and sustaining continuous improvement (Alton-Lee, 2003; Fouts, 2003; Hill & Russell, 1999).

### 2.5.3 Knowledge and practice of quality pedagogies

The research literature indicates the importance of pedagogies that motivate, engage and commit students to learning, as well as enhancing students’ strategies for learning. Flexibility, creativity and adaptability in using a range of teaching pedagogies and resources that take into account different student needs and expectations have been reported as having a positive impact on student learning (Darling-Hammond, 2000; Predmore, 2005; Sachs, 2003).

**Frameworks of teacher pedagogy**

Fred Newmann and colleagues in the USA (Newmann & Associates, 1996) have contributed significant research into ‘thoughtfulness’ and ‘authentic achievement and pedagogy’ in classrooms. Following suit, Australian research has identified frameworks of teacher pedagogy that link to enhanced academic and social outcomes for students, such as ‘productive pedagogies’ (Hayes, Lingard & Mills, 2000; QSRLS, 2001), ‘quality teaching’ pedagogies (NSW Department of Education & Training, 2003), and ‘engaging pedagogies’ (Fair Go Team, 2006). This research has much in common, reporting that pedagogies which provide intellectual rigour make connections with students’ prior knowledge and identities and are implemented in environments that promote learning and the students as learners.

Observational data from the QSRLS identified that teachers varied significantly in the types of pedagogies they implemented (QSRLS, 2003). Those teachers who rated high on ‘productive pedagogies’ accepted responsibility for providing quality learning opportunities for students and for improving their learning outcomes. They also regularly engaged in professional conversations about their teaching.

**Adapting pedagogy to improve student motivation**

Securing and sustaining student motivation to learn (Day, 2000; QSRLS, 2001; Wenglinsky, 2002) requires a range of teaching and meta-cognitive learning strategies rather than a single, rigid approach. Effective teachers adjust their use of pedagogies to fit the needs of different students and the demands of different instructional goals, topics, methods and contexts. Darling-Hammond’s (2000) synthesis of the research into teacher quality and student achievement found:

No single instructional strategy has been found to be unvaryingly successful; instead, teachers who are able to use a broad repertoire of approaches skilfully (eg direct and indirect instruction, experience-based and skill-based approaches, lecture and small group work) are typically most successful. The use of different strategies occurs in the context of ‘active teaching’ that is purposeful and diagnostic rather than random or laissez-faire and that responds to student needs as well as curriculum goals (p 10).

Even when high-stakes end-of-school examinations were involved, Ayres, Sawyer, and Dinham (2004) found that generating interest in and understanding of the subject was a key concern for 19 teachers of high achieving Year 12 students. These teachers used a variety of pedagogies that emphasised students’ involvement with and application of knowledge.

**Meta-learning strategies and student self-efficacy**

Evidence showed that quality teachers engaged students in a range of meta-learning strategies to enhance their active involvement in learning. Strategies that have been identified include explicit teaching methods, constructivist teaching, cooperative learning and student-led questioning (Fouts, 2003). Darling-Hammond’s (2000b) synthesis reported that teachers’ abilities to structure material, ask higher-order questions, use student ideas, and probe students’ comments were important variables in enhancing students’ learning achievement.

Alton-Lee (2003), Fouts (2003), the Fair Go Team (2006), Hayes, Lingard & Mills (2000) and QSRLS (2001) found that classrooms that supported student learning showed evidence of student control and self-regulation: students are encouraged to take responsibility for their learning and are given the confidence to express themselves and take legitimate risks. Teachers motivate students to see how school is of value for them and their aspirations and make the purpose of learning overt. Sinclair and
Johnson (2006) found that quality teaching involved negotiating learning tasks with students so they have some control over the choice of activity, pace, time and assessment criteria. In the primary context, Sinclair and Johnson (2006) found that students knew where resources could be found and were taught how to use and access them.

Alton-Lee’s (2003) review reported that quality pedagogy promoted students’ learning of self-regulation, meta-cognitive learning strategies and thoughtful and tactful discourse. The latter was developed through the use of student-led questioning techniques, teachers’ wait time for responses, and opportunities for students to participate in critical and creative thinking and to apply their learning. Teachers also made transparent to students the links between their efforts and their accomplishments. Similarly, Sinclair and Johnson (2006) found that quality teachers used multiple pedagogies, moving between transmission and constructivist approaches. They used explicit, direct teaching, but also gave students a substantial role in the reflective creation of knowledge. Several studies have also identified positive effects when a shared meta-language for learning was developed by, and used with students (Alton-Lee 2003; Fouts, 2003).

Relationships and the teaching-learning environment

The research literature has reported that quality teaching involves the establishment of quality teaching/learning environments and quality relationships. These places and relationships were supportive, inclusive, ‘owned’ by teachers and students, and effective for different types of students (Alton-Lee, 2003; OECD, 2005). In developing quality relationships, quality teachers used class sessions to build community and cohesion. In Munns, Woodward and Koletti’s (2006) case study of one classroom, there was evidence of positive student-student and student-teacher interactions and interdependence, as well as shared ownership of the teaching/learning space, mutual respect, tolerance and understanding. Students’ work was displayed so that students, teachers and parents could have meaningful conversations about it.

The meta-analyses of research by Alton-Lee (2003) and Fouts (2003), plus findings from several longitudinal research projects identified a number of features of supportive and inclusive teaching/learning environments (Fair Go Team, 2006; Hayes, Lingard & Mills, 2000; QSRLS, 2001). These features include:

- teachers’ belief in their students’ abilities to learn at high levels regardless of student backgrounds;
- students’ feeling of safety and sense of belonging;
- optimal use of a variety of grouping structures, including cooperative groups, structured peer interactions, individual work and heterogeneous groups;
- a ‘welcoming’ and stimulating feel extended to family and community members as well as to students; and
- classroom management practices emphasising and facilitating learning rather than control of behaviour.

In the secondary context, Sawyer and Dinham (2004) found that the classes of quality teachers of high-achieving Year 12 students were relaxed but highly focused teaching/learning environments.

Assessment for learning

A key element of quality teaching is providing feedback to students—appropriate feedback has been found to be a powerful moderator of student achievement (Fouts, 2003; Hattie, 2002). The research evidence examined by Alton-Lee (2003) demonstrated the importance of providing specific, frequent, positive and responsive feedback to students. In addition, Black and Harrison (2001) found that the provision of feedback in terms of comments, rather than marks, on student homework enhanced student learning and transferred the responsibility for that learning to the students themselves. From their longitudinal case study of one class Munns, Woodward and Koletti (2006) identified the importance of written, oral and symbolic feedback on students’ learning by the teacher. They also found that students’ self-assessments were related to students’ concepts of themselves as learners.

Compared with macro-level testing, micro-level assessment has shown more positive outcomes for teaching quality and students’ learning (Masters & Forster, 2000), providing teachers with greater knowledge of individual student attainment. This knowledge improved teacher planning and provision for students’ learning. Student observations and analyses of students’ work gave teachers greater insights into students’ performance when compared to assessments based on test paper results. One problem with micro-level assessment, however, is that it may or may not be used to improve teaching. Alton-Lee (2003) reported that New Zealand literacy teachers had not adjusted their teaching to take account of the results of such assessment. Instead they reportedly blamed alleged deficiencies in the students, their families or communities for the results. Further research is needed to establish how teachers adjust their teaching to take account of the result of micro-level assessment for learning, and how this may impact on quality teaching and student outcomes.

Together, this research indicates the complexities of quality teaching and of particular quality teaching practices. Further research is needed to explore the relationships among differing pedagogies, diverse student groups, their potential funds of knowledge and learning achievements. This work needs to continue. Further exploration of the ways in which diverse teacher groups engage with quality teaching pedagogies and the transferability to different school contexts is to be welcomed.
2.6 Attributes and capabilities of quality teachers

Quality teachers possess a range of personal, relational and professional attributes and capabilities. They are well qualified and credentialed. Quality teaching depends on the ongoing development of teachers’ knowledge about teaching, learning and students.

The impact of quality teaching on student outcomes is related to teachers’ class-based practices, teacher professional development and teacher characteristics (Wenglinsky, 2002). The research reviewed in this section indicates that quality teachers exhibit a range of attributes and capabilities (fig. 2.4) including:

• personal qualities such as enthusiasm, commitment and passion;
• high levels of communication skills;
• reflective, reflexive practices;
• relational qualities such as leadership capabilities and collaborative skills;
• professional qualities together with pedagogical capabilities; and
• in-depth specialised knowledge.

2.6.1 Personal

Across the literature, quality teachers were found to be enthusiastic, creative, committed and passionate about their work (OECD, 2005).

Enthusiasm, passion and commitment

Darling-Hammond (2000b) reported that research on teacher personality and behaviour found that teachers’ enthusiasm, as well as the knowledge they gained through professional development, may enhance student achievement. Likewise, the case studies in the Fair Go Project (2006) found that teachers who were enthusiastic and interested in their students and in their profession were recognised by their principals as quality teachers who were enhancing student outcomes.

High levels of communication

Darling-Hammond (2000b) reported that the research recognises a link between quality teaching, communication and pedagogical skills. Teachers’ verbal ability has been found to be related to student achievement (Goldhaber, 2002). In particular, teachers’ abilities to convey ideas in clear and convincing ways have been shown to positively influence student learning (OECD, 2005).

Motivation to enter teaching

In analysing teacher attributes (such as ‘enthusiasm’) a considerable amount of research has focused on why people initially enter teaching (for example, Dinham & Scott, 2000; O’Brien, & Schillaci, 2002; Public Agenda Online, 2000; Richardson & Watt, 2005). This research has attempted to investigate variations in motivations between different groupings of teacher aspirants according to gender, ethnicity, levels of academic achievement, different nationalities, and/or age (Sinclair, Dowson & McInerney, 2006), and those making a career change to teaching (Richardson & Watt, 2005). Evidence of ‘internal’ and ‘external’ motivations for entering the teaching profession was reported.

Internal motivations that influence the desire to become a teacher included a:

• ‘love’ or desire to work with children or adolescents;
• perceived worth or value of teaching to others;
• desire to help other people;
• love of learning or teaching;
• love of a particular subject area especially among prospective secondary teachers; and
• desire to impart knowledge.
Katzenmeyer and Moller (2001) define teacher-leaders as:

- ways, including at committee, class, grade and school levels.
- research has shown that teachers can lead in a variety with positions such as principal, head teacher or faculty head.
- The more usual definitions of leadership have equated it 
- Defining ‘teacher leadership’ is inconsistent in the literature.

2.6.2 Relational

Leadership

Defining ‘teacher leadership’ is inconsistent in the literature. The more usual definitions of leadership have equated it with positions such as principal, head teacher or faculty head. However, research has shown that teachers can lead in a variety of ways, including at committee, class, grade and school levels. Katzenmeyer and Moller (2001) define teacher-leaders as:

- teachers who are leaders within and beyond the classroom, identify with and contribute to a community of teacher learners and leaders, and influence others toward improved educational practice (p. 3).

In their qualitative study of 10 schools in England, Harris and Muijs (2004) found that opportunities to develop and show leadership had positive impacts on teachers’ morale, self-esteem, self-efficacy, work satisfaction and retention. Teacher leadership can also lower absenteeism by contributing to school improvement through enhanced student engagement and improved student outcomes (Harris & Muijs, 2004). Further discussion of teacher leadership is covered in Chapter 3, ‘What is Quality School Leadership’.

Collaboration within and between schools

Research shows that teachers benefited from working with their colleagues and other educators within and outside their own schools (Hargreaves, 2000), regularly addressing educational issues as they deal with others. According to Luke (2004) they ‘work, communicate, and exchange—physically and virtually—across national and regional boundaries with each other, with educational researchers, teacher educators, curriculum developers, and indeed, senior educational bureaucrats’ (p. 1439). Moreover, the quality of teaching was increased when teachers shared good practices, worked effectively with colleagues in collaborative planning, and learned together (Fouts, 2003; Harris, 2004; Harris & Muijs, nd; OECD, 2005; Sinclair & Johnson, 2006). A focused study of team teaching showed that, whilst it required careful planning and collaboration, teachers used their particular strengths and furthered their own professional development by observing the strengths of teaching partners (Woodward & Sinclair, 2005). Likewise the development of educative relationships with parents and caregivers increased the possibility of enhancing quality teaching.

Collaboration between teachers has also been established as being important for moral support, the sharing of workloads, eliminating duplication and increasing collective confidence to, explore or adopt innovations (Hargreaves 2000). Collaborative discussions and actions have also been shown to be important to both successful professional learning and the capacity-building of the school (Hargreaves, 2000; Meiers & Ingvason, 2005; Retaillick, nd). A word of caution, however, arises from Webb et al’s (2004) comparative study of teachers in England and Finland. Perhaps ironically, cooperation was identified as a major form of control on teachers’ work at both the individual and school levels. It meant that the teachers had to achieve consensus with colleagues in their approaches to teaching, and school decision-making was found to be steered by other schools, agencies or community organisations.

2.6.3 Professional

Based on her scan of the literature, Watson (2005, p vii) defines ‘teacher quality’ as ‘expertise in relevant subject content studies coupled with skills in teaching and learning’. Teachers’ attitudes to continuous learning and reflection are also critical to teacher quality. These processes are most successful when they involve action learning and professional dialogue, and are closely aligned to the teacher’s current teaching practice.

Initial academic qualifications

Teachers’ initial academic qualifications acquired through teacher preparation courses are a good indicator of quality teaching and have been shown to impact students’ outcomes (Darling-Hammond, 2000; 2000b; Darling-Hammond & Youngs, 2002; Goe, 2002; Laczko-Kerr & Berliner, 2002; Lovat, 2003). The research identified that:

- Depth of content/subject knowledge enables teachers to use efficacious teaching/learning strategies that promote higher-order creative and critical thinking. It includes keeping up with current research and scholarship within a discipline or particular subject. In the case of quality teachers, this knowledge interacts with teachers’ knowledge of teaching, learning and the characteristics of students to enhance students’ social and academic achievements.
Evidence indicates that pedagogical knowledge is an essential component of the knowledge and skill base of quality teachers (Lovat, 2003). Such knowledge has a significant effect on students’ learning outcomes (Darling-Hammond, 2000b; Goldhaber, 2002; Hill, Rowan & Ball, 2005; Masters, 2003). For example, Darling-Hammond (2000) reported one study that found that Year 4 students had better reading achievement when their teachers had masters’ degrees, were fully certified and had undertaken professional coursework in literacy-based instruction. In comparison, students achieved less if their teachers were trained solely in phonics. Similarly, Hill, Rowan and Ball (2005) found that teachers’ ‘mathematical knowledge for teaching’ was significantly related to student achievement gains in first and third grade (p.39).

Quality teachers have subject matter knowledge as well as knowledge of students and their learning processes. Research into the relationship between subject matter knowledge and quality teaching, however, is somewhat contradictory. For instance, Masters (2003) and Goldhaber (2002) reported a significant relationship between teachers’ grasp of subject matter and their practices. Sinclair and Johnson (2006) found that quality teachers in low-SES primary schools knew their subject matter well enough to guide students’ learning and provide them with information on a ‘need to know’ basis. Darling-Hammond (2000b), however, found there was no consistent relationship between National Teacher Examination (NTE) scores on subject matter knowledge and teacher performances as measured by student outcomes or supervisory ratings in the USA. She reported students of certified, middle school (Years 5-8) mathematics teachers achieved higher gains than those taught by teachers not certified in this subject. There was, however, no linear relationship between the number of courses the teachers had studied in mathematics and their performance as teachers. Rather, a plateau effect was recorded once teachers studied five courses. Goldhaber (2002) also reported the lack of a linear relationship between content knowledge and students’ learning outcomes. Darling-Hammond (2000b) concluded that subject matter knowledge was a positive influence up to some basic competence but was less important afterwards.

The integration of content and pedagogy is also important: within the content of quality initial teacher education courses, studies have found positive effects for a focus on teaching. For example, a study of 200 graduates from one institution found the amount of education coursework completed accounted for more than four times the variance in teacher performance (16.5%) compared with measures of content knowledge (<4%) (Darling-Hammond, 2000b). In addition, Ariza, del Pozo and Toscano (2002) found that teacher education programs developed around real world educational problems enhanced student-teachers’ professional practice and capacity for curricular innovation.

Research literature also raises questions about the most efficacious forms of quality initial teacher education:

- Some debate centres on the advantages of longer courses and the possibilities of more flexible systems of initial teacher education (OECD, 2005).
- The balance between school and university-based initial teacher education and the impact on the attributes and capabilities of quality teachers are also matters for debate in the literature. The arguments focus on the amount of improvement in beginning teachers (Tabberer, 2003); the demands on the schools for school-based approaches to initial teacher education (Furlong, 1996); and the evolving roles of research by university academics and school teachers (Burton, 1998; Hobson, 2000; Hoppers, 2001; Maynard, 2000).

Further research into the impact of initial teacher education on the development of attributes and capabilities of quality teachers seems desirable.

The impact of professional preparation on teacher satisfaction and retention

There is evidence of negative impacts when teachers are not prepared, or prepared through short alternate routes (eg Darling-Hammond, 2000b; Sheets, 2004). Such teachers were found to:

- be less satisfied with their training;
- have greater difficulties with planning curriculum, teaching, managing their classes and diagnosing students’ learning needs;
- lack contextual knowledge or the ability to use culturally responsive curricular content;
- be rated less highly on instructional skills by principals, supervisors and colleagues; and
- leave teaching at a higher than average rate.
Lack of preparation for teaching, work intensification, low pay, pupil misbehaviour and a lack of public respect were all factors that were found to discourage teachers from remaining in the profession. In particular, limited initial teacher education can lead to high attrition rates for beginning teachers during the first five years of teaching. Analysis of research on ‘Teach for America’ found that, relative to those that provided less training and support, carefully designed initial teacher education programs yield positive outcomes in terms of teacher effectiveness and retention (Darling-Hammond, 2000b). Commitment to children, the possibilities for professional freedom and supportive colleagues were also positive influences on teacher retention (Darling-Hammond, Chung & Frelow, 2002; Webb, Vulliamy, Hämäläinen, Sarja, Kimonen & Nevalainen, 2004b).

**Ongoing professional learning**

Knowledge of students, student learning, content and pedagogy is not static: as noted in Section 2.4 above, the characteristics of students, and of the knowledge they are required to learn, changes with time. The research records that knowledge about content, learners and pedagogy cannot be achieved through an initial teacher education course only. Considerable evidence indicates that quality teaching depends on the ongoing development of teachers’ knowledge about subject content, teaching, learning, students and education policies (Han, 2004; Masters, 2003; Zeichner, 2003).

The importance of a life-long and life-wide (ACDE, 2004) learning approach amongst teachers has also been highlighted in Preston’s (2003) statistical analyses of age profiles and separation rates of Australian teachers. She concluded that, given the imminent retirement of many in the older cohort of teachers, beginning teachers needed to be supported and included in the work of the school. Teachers under 40 years of age required appropriate ongoing professional learning and leadership opportunities before the older cohort of teachers retired.

Day’s (2004) studies of teachers who have and maintain a passion for teaching, learning and development over their career; found that to improve teachers, professional development must accommodate their personal needs and acknowledge their hearts, ie their passions, enthusiasms and personal identities, as much as their knowledge and skill levels. Ways of encouraging younger teachers to be involved in effective professional learning programs, and the relationships between these and retention, are areas for ongoing research.

A disposition toward self-awareness, willingness to engage in reflective practice and to be self-judging have been found to be beneficial in teachers’ professional learning and improvement in their practices (Norsworthy, 2001; Quicke, 2000). Fendler’s (2003) historical review of research on teacher reflection, however, concluded that reflection undertaken in isolation, such as in reflective journal writing, can be an undesirable practice that merely reinforces the status quo, encouraging the reproduction of teachers’ existing educational understandings and pedagogies. This finding is consistent with research which has demonstrated the importance of feedback, collaboration and discussion amongst professional colleagues, and more long-term, active methods of professional learning for improved teacher performance (Ewing, 2002; Leitch & Day, 2000). More active professional learning methods included action research, action learning, evidence-rich practice, mentoring and coaching (Hoban, 2004; Zeichner, 2003). These models require dispositions of openness to suggestions from colleagues, collaborative skills, and a willingness and capacity to experiment with ideas in order to improve professional practices (Day, 2003).

Evidence from Darling-Hammond (2000b), Ingvarson, Meiers and Beavis (2003) has shown that opportunities for teachers to participate in efficacious continuing professional learning result in:

- effectively engaging teachers in their own learning;
- increased teacher knowledge, practice and sense of efficacy;
- higher levels of student achievement;
- improvements in the nature and extent of collaborative work among teaching colleagues in schools; and
- strengthening and integrating their professional community activities.

In a survey of 3,250 teachers exploring the links between teacher professional development and student learning outcomes, Meiers & Ingvarson, (2005) found that the ‘opportunity to learn’ features of ongoing professional development programs (ie. content, active follow-up, collaboration and feedback) had significant effects on teacher knowledge, practice and efficacy. They also had significant indirect effects on student learning outcomes, accounting for 59% of the variance in the impact of the ongoing professional learning on teaching practice. Variables such as teachers’ gender, experience, school sector/level, support and size were also shown to have links to the impact of ongoing professional learning.

The kind, extent and recency of ongoing professional learning have been shown to influence teacher performance. For example, one-off intensive workshops have limitations: Law (2003) found that such workshops had limited impact because participants were not given adequate time to grasp, debate and experiment with initiatives thoroughly before implementation. Across the literature, worthwhile professional learning was reported as contributing to changes in teaching practice and improved student learning outcomes when it:
• increased teachers’ understanding of the content they taught, how students learn that content and how they could represent and convey that content in meaningful ways (Darling-Hammond, 2000b; Hargreaves, 2000; Meiers & Ingvarson, 2005; Sachs, 2000);
• was aligned to the whole school vision and management plan (Meiers & Ingvarson, 2005; Sinclair & Johnson, 2006);
• targeted the grade or group of students that teachers taught (Sinclair & Johnson, 2006);
• involved active learning, including components of theory, practice, reflection, feedback and follow-up action (Hoban, 2004; Ingvarson, Meiers & Beavis, 2003; Masters & Forster, 2000; Meiers & Ingvarson, 2005; Quicke, 2000; Sachs, 2001); and
• was supported by school leaders (Hargreaves, 2000; Meiers & Ingvarson, 2005).
Research provides evidence that there is a positive relationship between years of teaching experience and quality teaching. As might be expected, novice teachers are less efficacious than teachers who have built on their initial teacher education through professional development and critical reflection on their teaching experiences. However this difference levels off after about five years for those teachers who do not engage in continuing professional development (Darling-Hammond, 2000). Veteran teachers in settings that emphasise ongoing collaborative learning, however, continue to improve their performance and knowledge.

The argument for professional standards and certification
Professional standards are being used around the world to establish expectations of what teachers should know, understand and be able to do when they enter the profession, as well as throughout their professional careers. In Australia, principles for guiding the development of standards have been developed at the national level (Kleinhenz & Ingvarson, 2004). Likewise, generic standards and performance indicators for ‘levels’ of teachers during their careers have been developed throughout state systems. However, these are largely used as tools for assessing annual salary increments rather than teacher performance. Subject-specific standards for accomplished teaching are now being developed by teacher professional associations.

The research literature reports both positive and negative outcomes of using professional standards for seemingly contradictory tasks of teacher assessment and the enhancement of the profession. For example, Darling-Hammond (2000b) found that teaching standards could help ensure that all students have teachers who were equipped to work with and support them and their families. Professional standards such as those used in Western Australia’s Level 3 Classroom Teacher Position, and the US National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), have been found to impact positively on quality teaching (Bond, 2003; Kleinheinz & Ingvarson, 2004; Prest, 2003; Sachs, 2003). This research reported that these positive outcomes occurred because:
• the assessment processes were rigorous and used innovative approaches to assessing teacher performance;
• the assessment processes used multiple sources of data;
• teachers were assessed by specially trained assessors;
• the assessment linked a set of professional standards with professional learning and the ongoing work of quality teachers;
• the standards were implemented within schools which operated as professional learning communities; and
• the standards covered the collective, collegial and collaborative work and potential of the teaching profession, and were not just concerned with the attributes of individuals.
Research has found that professional standards are not without their difficulties, both in conception and implementation (Darling-Hammond, 1999; Kleinheinz & Ingvarson, 2004; Sachs, 2003). Groundwater-Smith and Sachs (2002) reported that standards did not solve the problems of dysfunctional school organisation, outmoded curricula, inequitable allocation of resources or lack of social supports for children and youth. There were other negative impacts of using professional standards for teacher assessment:
• the mandatory application of professional standards on top of a teacher’s already heavy workload made the task of quality teaching even more demanding;
• codifying and making teachers’ knowledge, expertise and competence public had industrial consequences in terms of working conditions, recognition and rewarding teacher learning; and
• few US teachers took up the opportunity to undergo the process of becoming NBPTS certified. This was due to the financial and time commitments required for undertaking the standards-based assessment process.
On the whole, professional standards have been found to contribute to the ongoing professional learning of teachers where this is their primary purpose (Darling-Hammond, 2000b; Sachs, 2003; Tabberer, 2003). For example, the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS, 2001) reported that teachers found the act of going through the application for NBPTS certification was a valuable professional learning experience. They reported it had a positive impact on their teaching and consequential positive effects on students’ learning, as well as leading to positive interactions between teachers, administrators and community members (Kleinhenz & Ingvarson, 2004). Research on the effects of professional standards on the quality of teaching and teacher development and retention is still in the early stages. The long-term influence of standards on student learning outcomes is an area for further investigation.

The relationship between qualifications and student outcomes

The research literature argues for the importance of a regulated profession of highly qualified, licensed teachers which is self-governing, autonomous, self-surveillant and trusted (Darling-Hammond, 2000b; Hargreaves, 2000; Laczko-Kerr & Berliner, 2002; Luke, 2004). A substantial body of research indicates a positive relationship between teacher certification and improved student achievements (Darling-Hammond, 2000b; Darling-Hammond & Youngs, 2002; Goe, 2002; Laczko-Kerr & Berliner, 2002; Lovat, 2003). Evidence supporting this relationship has demonstrated:

- a significant relationship between quality initial teacher education, certification measures and students’ achievements—although this is mitigated by school, school district and state level factors (Darling-Hammond & Youngs, 2002; Laczko-Kerr & Berliner, 2002);
- students were less likely to drop out of school when taught by teachers with certification in their field, by those with a master’s degree and by those enrolled in graduate studies (Darling-Hammond, 2000b; Darling-Hammond & Youngs, 2002; Goe, 2002; Laczko-Kerr & Berliner, 2002; Lovat, 2003). Evidence supporting this relationship has demonstrated:

  - the proportion of new ‘teachers’ who were uncertified; and
  - the proportion of teachers who held less than a minor in the field they taught.

Laczko-Kerr and Berliner (2002) studied the state-mandated student assessment results of 293 recently hired under-certified and certified teachers from five low-income, inner city, largely minority districts in Arizona, including one subset of under-certified teachers from the USA’s ‘Teach For America’ (a program that addresses teacher shortages by permitting under-certified teachers to work in classrooms). Students taught by certified teachers who had studied at accredited universities and met all state requirements for initial certification out-performed students of TFA under-qualified, under-certified teachers on all three tests of reading, mathematics and language arts. Laczko-Kerr and Berliner found that ‘university-prepared teachers are of higher quality than those prepared without an approved program of preparation’ (p. 39). They concluded that allowing under-certified TFA recruits to work in difficult schools increases differences in achievement between the performance of students who are also otherwise disadvantaged socially or economically.
These results suggest the need to research education (and training) reforms for creating more thoughtful licensing systems, more productive teacher education programs, and more effective professional development strategies. This research could ascertain the strength of their effects on teaching and learning approaches, and the strengthening of teachers’ capabilities to teach diverse learners using a wide repertoire of diagnostic strategies.

2.7 Conclusion

This chapter has outlined factors from the research literature that demonstrate what is defined as ‘quality teaching.’ It began with evidence of an array of contextual factors, including social, technical, political, economic and cultural changes that are affecting the work of teachers and the quality of teaching. Evidence of the influence of specific school environmental factors on quality teaching was also provided. Several studies provided evidence indicating that quality teachers are flexible in contextualising their professional practices and embracing changes, even though this may intensify their workload. There was also substantial evidence showing that quality teaching means engaging students with content that is of high intellectual quality, using a range of teaching and meta-cognitive learning practices that are responsive to the needs of diverse student populations as well as the demands of varying instructional goals, topics and methods.

A substantial body of research has identified the qualities of effective curriculum design and implementation. However, the question of how curricula are best designed and managed, and who should have responsibility for curriculum design are areas for further investigation. Similarly debates about the nature and content of professional education courses for teachers, how best to involve teachers, particularly beginning teachers, in ongoing professional learning and what constitutes an appropriate licensing system for quality teachers indicate areas for future research.

Professional standards are being used around the world to establish expectations of what teachers should know, understand and be able to do when they enter the profession, and throughout their professional careers. The evidence suggests their implementation is being met with varying levels of acceptance by teachers. Further research is required to clarify the relationships between differing standards frameworks, quality teaching, assessment of quality teachers, enhanced student outcomes and the enhancement of the profession. The next chapter reviews the growing body of research on the character and effects of quality school leadership on a school, on teachers and on student outcomes.
Overall, evidence from research suggests that quality school leadership matters. It affects school outcomes including students’ social and academic achievements, teacher performance and school-community relations. Changes in school, teacher and student performance are partly attributed to changes in leadership contexts, to differing practices, organisations, structures and processes of leadership, and/or to the qualities and capacities of leaders themselves.

‘Leadership’ can be provided by a single person or by many, is characterised by vision, intention and influence and has a basis in values. Three domains of quality school leadership are explored in this chapter’s synthesis of recent research:

- contextual factors;
- the professional practices of school leaders; and
- the attributes and capabilities of school leaders.

There is considerable research on the nature and effects of quality school leadership (Hallinger & Heck, 1996; Leithwood & Riehl, 2003; Leithwood, Seashore-Louis, Anderson & Wahlstrom, 2004). While most of the studies have focused on principals, using case study designs with small sample sizes and self-report methodologies, there have been a few large-scale quantitative studies and several large qualitative studies involving diverse participants across school communities (Leithwood, 2005; Silins & Mulford, 2002; Witziers, Bosker & Kruger, 2003).

### 3.1 What is ‘quality school leadership’?

Quality school leadership may be enacted by an individual or by a number of people within a school community. It provides direction, involves a process of influence with intention, and is value-based and vision-driven.

**Defining features of school leadership**

As discussed in Chapter 2, the concept of ‘quality school leadership’ is complex and has given rise to a diversity of definitions: in 1988 Cuban found ‘more than 350 definitions of leadership but no clear and unequivocal understanding of what distinguishes leaders from non-leaders’ However a more recent synthesis of 20 years of school leadership research by Leithwood & Riehl (2003) identified two common attributes of leadership:

- providing direction; and
- involving a process of influence.

These dual functions of leadership were encapsulated in their definition that ‘leaders mobilize and work with others to articulate and achieve shared intentions’ (Leithwood and Riehl, 2003, p. 7).

The use of the word ‘intentions’ brings forward two further attributes of leadership identified through research:

- leadership is value-based; and
- leaders are goal or vision-driven, with these goals reportedly emanating from their personal and/or professional value systems (Day, Harris & Hadfield, 2001).

**Who can be a school leader?**

While it is common to equate ‘leadership’ with principals and faculty heads, leadership can take many forms and can occur at many levels. Yukl (2002), for example, defined leadership as involving intentional influence over other people exerted by a single person or a group. The research recognises that a variety of members of a school community can be leaders, and ‘leadership’ can encompass one or more diverse roles within the school (Leithwood & Riehl, 2003):

- positional leaders who have influence through their formal authority;
- personal leaders who lead in a less formal capacity by drawing on their personal qualities, professional standing and/or social circumstances (Gronn, 2000; Gronn & Hamilton, 2004; Harris 2004, 2004b; Spillane, Halverson & Diamond, 2004);
- community members (Gunter & Ribbins, 2003); and
- students (Fair Go Team, 2006; Gunter & Ribbins, 2003; West-Burnham, 2004).

Some research distinguishes school leaders from teacher-leaders, finding that different and specific roles are ascribed to each. Teacher-leaders primarily focus on leading and improving teaching and learning practices (Andrews & Crowther, 2002; Crowther, 2002; York-Barr & Duke, 2004).

### Domains of quality school leadership

As for quality teaching, the evidence about quality school leadership may be grouped into three key domains, reflecting the definitions and research findings discussed above.

- Contextual Factors
- Attributes & Capabilities
- Professional Practices

**Figure 3.1: Quality school leadership domains**
Several significant questions about the role of quality school leadership in improving schooling are framed within these domains (Table 3.1) and addressed in the following sections of this chapter.

### Table 3.1: Questions for the key domains of quality school leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Key questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contexts of school leadership</td>
<td>• What are the current contextual factors influencing leadership in schools?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• What student outcomes and school contexts can be influenced by quality school leadership?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional practices of school leaders</td>
<td>• What strategies do quality leaders implement?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• How can effective leadership be organised in schools?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Who can lead in schools?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attributes and capabilities of quality school leaders</td>
<td>• What personal, relational, organisational and professional qualities help in successful leadership?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• How can quality school leaders be recruited, developed and maintained?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.2 Contexts and quality school leadership

There is agreement across the research literature that the quality of school leaders is affected by contextual factors such as:

- current economic, political and policy frameworks governing the teaching profession;
- location and size of the school; and
- the cultural and socio-economic diversity of the school community.

In turn, leaders have the capacity to affect:

- socio-economic factors affecting schooling;
- school organisation, culture and teaching behaviours; and
- social and academic outcomes of the school communities in which they work.

The following sections (3.2.1 and 3.2.2) are interrelated (as shown in fig. 3.2). The first deals with the way in which quality school leadership is influenced by the extended and immediate contexts in which it occurs. The second deals with the impact of quality school leadership on schools and on student outcomes.

#### 3.2.1 Contexts influencing quality school leadership

Quality school leadership is influenced—and challenged—by the contexts in which it occurs.

Figure 3.3 below and the following sub-sections present the key contextual factors affecting school leadership and the associated findings from the research.

#### Economic, political and policy change: challenges for school leaders

Economic, political and policy change influences the complexity and intensity of the work of school leaders. Research into globalisation and global market pressures shows that since the 1980s, public schools across OECD countries have continued to experience tighter funding constraints and a growing culture of ‘managerialism’ (OECD, 2001). More specifically, literature reporting on structural and policy reforms in school education systems over the past 20 to 30 years has identified the following trends, both within Australia and in other countries:

- increased accountability in terms of auditing school effectiveness, student attainment and the maintenance of standards (Groundwater-Smith & Sachs, 2002; Hargreaves, 2000; Leithwood, 2005; Leithwood & Riehl, 2003; Sachs, 2001);
• market regulation of education (wherein governments and business and, to a lesser extent, parents and communities have more say over schooling)—and schools are required to spend additional time and resources competing for both students and funding (Dempster 2000; Lingard, Hayes & Mills, 2002);
• increased moves towards self-managing or self-governing schools—occurring within the context of greater accountability and competition (Blackmore, 2004; Dempster, 2000); and
• increased complexity in the principal’s role, with expectations that principals will perform as managers, marketers and education leaders (Day, Harris & Hadfield, 2001; Storey, 2004; Webb, Vulliamy, Hamalainen, Sarja, Kimonen & Nevalainen, 2004a).

In Norway, increased accountability measures were imposed on teachers through site-based management and work-time agreements that required them to work an additional 190 hours per year in organised professional planning and training. This had large negative effects on both the staff and leaders in two upper secondary schools (Moller, 1999): teachers became drained of any enthusiasm and non-compliant, leaving those in leadership and administrative roles frustrated. Hargreaves (1994) found that strategies such as mandated work-time arrangements induced ‘contrived collegiality’ which resulted in inflexibility and inefficiency. For instance, it was established that teachers did not meet when they should, misunderstood the purposes of the meetings or met when there was no business to discuss.

Several UK studies reported on the difficulties school-leaders had in obtaining external support and resources for managing change and improving schools (Ansell, 2004; Hargreaves & Fink 2003). The leaders developed anger and frustration with the outside agencies who were supposed to be available to help, and feelings of being overwhelmed and alone.

Impact of change on recruitment, retention and morale of school leaders

Research has found that the demands and challenges faced by contemporary school leaders are complex, multidimensional and sometimes contradictory (Day, Harris & Hadfield, 2001; Duignan, 2003; Leithwood & Riehl, 2003; Leithwood 2005; Mulford & Silins, 2003; Scott, 2003; Spillane, Halverson & Diamond 2004; Wildy & Louden, 2000). Internationally and nationally research reports concerns about the number of education leaders who are retiring at principal, assistant principal and middle management levels (Hargreaves & Fink, 2003; Scott, 2003; Spry & Duignan, 2003; Whitaker, 2003). There is a shortage of qualified, experienced applicants to fill positions and the challenges of recruiting new cohorts of leaders have created uncertainty amongst current leaders.

Studies based on principals’ self-reports and observations of colleagues conclude that increasing accountability demands generated through continuous large-scale education reforms, plus mounting parental and societal expectations of schools, have added intensity as well as complexity to the job of principal (Day, Harris & Hadfield, 2001). Further, increased time-on-the-job requirements have been found to adversely impact on principals’ family lives, making the role increasingly unattractive to potential recruits (Scott, 2003). For example:
• Whitaker (2003) reported that the main deterrents for teachers considering promotion to principal were the impact that societal problems had on the role as well as increased work hours and stress levels which in turn, had negative effects on their family life.
• Blackmore (2004) found that teacher shortage and dearth of leaders in Victoria was a result of the centrally-mandated policies that created self-managing schools, a corporate managerial culture and market-driven accountability systems. Principals, pressured to succeed in the marketisation of their schools, lost collegiality with teachers and students - leaving teachers feeling de-valued, alienated and disillusioned by the lack of focus on the core work of teaching and learning.
• Spry and Duignan (2003) found difficulties in leadership succession in Queensland’s Catholic schools due to increased stresses and loss of job satisfaction.

Castagnoli and Cook (2004) investigated the dilemmas of leadership development without any immediate positional rewards. The head-teachers in their study reported that they were aware that developing people without internal rewards could drive staff to seek positions in other schools. However, the alternative led to stagnation and frustration for good staff. Some research from the UK found that school leaders were being de-skilled and needing considerable resilience to persevere with their jobs (Scott, 2003; Woods, 2002). They no longer had a sense of their expertise when dealing with elements of the extended context, especially centrally imposed curriculum changes.

As a consequence, schools are having difficulty in recruiting new leaders. A variety of strategies therefore, must continue to be developed to attract, develop, support and train quality school leaders (APAPDC, 2005). These findings raise the question of which qualities and specific skills enable leaders to do more than endure, and work through challenging times of change with robust hope.
Leadership challenges relating to local context: school location, socio-economic status, size and level

In addition to global and national drivers that change the extended context, schools have to address the distinctive combination of challenges that are specific to their own context. Based on a review of research on school leadership, Bush and Glover (2003) reported that school size, type, and location, socio-economic factors, governance, culture and parental activity—as well as the experience and commitment of staff—influence (but do not absolutely determine) the type of leadership employed in a school.

To explore the interaction of leadership, school performance and factors in the immediate school context, Mulford and Silins (2003) undertook an extensive survey of 2,500 teachers and 3,500 Year 10 students in Tasmania and South Australia in the Leadership for Organisational Learning and Student Outcomes (LOLSO) project. It was found that socio-economic status, home education environment and school size have interactive effects on leadership, school performance and student outcomes. An indication that operating contexts for metropolitan principals are more challenging was found also in the Leadership Capability Research Project in which 322 principals across NSW were surveyed (Scott, 2003). In addition:

- Mulford and Silins (2003) found that large metropolitan schools with student populations greater than 900 were not necessarily conducive to ‘transformational’ and ‘distributive’ leadership (as discussed later in Sections 3.3.2 and 3.3.3). While these large schools were more likely to have students with a higher academic self-concept they had lower student participation rates. This was an important finding given that student participation and engagement also related to student retention and academic achievement.

- These results give support to research in the USA that highlighted the advantages of smaller schools (Lee & Loeb, 2000). Bush and Glover (2003) found that smaller schools were more likely to nurture a sense of community belonging, as well as student and teacher involvement.

Some evidence shows that the level of school may also influence required curriculum knowledge in leaders. From their review of the research literature Leithwood, Seashore-Louis, Anderson and Wahlstrom (2004) concluded that successful primary principals usually have strong curricular knowledge, whereas secondary principals relied more on their department heads for this knowledge.

Together, these findings suggest the need for caution in transferring the policies and practices of leaders from one school to another without due consideration of their appropriateness in the extended or specific school context. More research is required to document the impact of any immediate contextual factors on quality school leadership and learning outcomes.

3.2.2 The impact of quality school leadership on schools and on student outcomes

Quality school leadership influences schools and student outcomes. However, the impact of school leaders on student outcomes is often indirect.

Student outcomes
Teacher effects: teacher efficacy and morale
School effects: building capacity

Figure 3.4: Quality school leadership’s influence on context

The impact of school leaders on student outcomes

It is hard to measure the impact of school leadership on student outcomes because the complex leadership relationships in schools are hard to identify and tease out (Hallinger & Heck, 1996; Leithwood & Rehl, 2003). Leithwood and Rehl’s (2003) synthesis looked at studies using a variety of methodologies including qualitative case studies, quasi-experimental quantitative research and modelling of educational effectiveness. These showed that principals have a salient but indirect effect on student outcomes through the goals they establish and the quality of the curriculum, teaching and learning environment they encourage within their schools.

Robinson (2005) also found that leadership theory development has not been grounded in the details of effective teaching and learning. Thus, it is not surprising that the research evidence shows leadership as making little direct difference to student outcomes. There is a need, therefore, for innovative approaches to researching quality school leadership. Grounding such studies in the details of effective teaching and learning could make it possible to ascertain the difference leadership makes to students’ socio-academic outcomes.

Nevertheless, several studies have provided evidence for the value of school leadership that focuses on students, teaching and learning:

- The Productive Pedagogies team in the extensive Queensland School Reform Longitudinal Study (QSRLS) (Lingard, Hayes & Mills, 2003) found that improved student outcomes occur when pedagogies are a priority of the school. In-depth case studies of three schools in the QSRLS produced evidence of successful leadership that focused on pedagogy within a culture of care (Hayes, Christie, Mills & Lingard, 2004).
• Dinham’s (2005) analysis of data from 50 sites across 38 secondary schools in NSW also found leadership to be a key factor in the achievement of outstanding educational outcomes. Whilst leadership was distributed within these schools, the principals ensured all staff focused on students and their learning.

• Likewise, Leithwood’s (2005) analysis of the International Successful School Principalship Project’s (ISSPP) eight country reports identified both classroom-based and school variables that were significantly influenced by those in leadership and led to demonstrable improvements in students’ learning (Table 3.2).

Table 3.2: In-school variables influenced by quality school leadership in the International Successful School Principalship Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom-based variables</th>
<th>School variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time on task (Australia)</td>
<td>Safe and orderly climate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of instruction or instructional climate (Norway, Australia, and U.S.A.)</td>
<td>Staff participation in school-wide decision making (China)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum (Australia, Norway and U.S.A.)</td>
<td>School culture (all countries)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher commitment (England, China and Denmark)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the English component of the ISSPP, Day (2005) reported on ten successful, experienced head-teachers working in a range of challenging, urban and suburban schools of different sizes. Each had raised the measurable levels of pupil attainments in their schools by establishing a ‘can do’ ethos amongst staff and parents. They also made known their passion for education, for students and for the communities in which they worked.

The impact of teacher-leaders on teaching practice and student outcomes

Because leadership in schools is becoming more ‘distributed’, teacher-leaders have assumed increased responsibility for leading improvements in teaching and learning. An important element in teacher leadership is the ability to influence the practice of others. As described in Chapter 2, research shows that teacher expertise may be linked to improvements in student outcomes. In their synthesis of two decades of research on teacher leadership, York-Barr and Duke (2004) identified five studies that directly examined the effects of teacher leadership on students. One, a qualitative study of three elementary schools, reported a positive effect on students’ learning because of the influence teacher-leaders had on the instructional practices of their colleagues. In contrast, two quantitative projects which involved 1,800 teachers and 16,390 students reported no statistically significant relationship between teacher leadership and student engagement (York-Barr & Duke, 2004). However, methodological problems in identifying ‘teacher leadership’ as a distinct variable may have confounded these results.

There is evidence that principals play a pivotal role in the success of teacher leadership by actively aligning structures and resources to support the leadership development and work of teachers (Harris & Muijs, 2004; York-Barr & Duke, 2004). Evidence shows that teacher-leaders have improved their own instructional practices through exposure to new information and instructional experiences, and have developed leadership and organisational skills. However there is limited evidence of the influence of teacher-leaders on the practices of their colleagues (York-Barr & Duke, 2004). Future research is recommended to clarify relationships between teacher-leaders and student outcomes, the collegial processes that effective teacher-leaders use, and the school cultures and structures that positively support teacher-leaders.

Making a difference in ‘challenging’ school contexts

Studies in several different countries have reported on the positive effects of school leadership on a variety of student social and academic outcomes in especially challenging schools. ‘Challenging’ schools often suffer from a multiplicity of challenges in their context:

• often located in structurally disadvantaged socio-economic areas suffering from adverse policy affects;
• negative student outcomes;
• a high turn-over of staff resulting in a high proportion of inexperienced or early-career staff; and
• large populations of recently arrived non-English speaking background students and limited resources to cater for these students.

The impact of sharing control with students on student outcomes

The Fair Go Project’s (2006) qualitative investigations of schools in low socio-economic areas of Sydney over six years found that students are more engaged in schooling when teachers shared control with students in their learning environments (McGuire & Cole, 2005). Students also had enhanced attendance rates and a sense that ‘school is for me’ when they shared control with teachers in both their classroom and school environments (Munns, Woodward & Zammit, 2005).
Based on their comprehensive review of research on how leadership influences student learning in challenging schools, Leithwood, Louis, Anderson and Wahlstrom (2004, p. 11) concluded that:

There are virtually no documented instances of troubled schools being turned around without intervention by a powerful leader. Many other factors may contribute to such turnarounds but leadership is the catalyst.

Two key leadership practices identified by Leithwood, Steinbach and Jantzi (2002) as making a difference to the students included:

- the principal’s demonstration of care for students; and
- their positive interactions with students.

Leithwood and Riehl (2003) found that successful leaders work with staff to reduce class size in early grades and adopt appropriate means to attract and retain good, qualified teachers.

There is considerable evidence indicating the central policies and practices of leadership that may be effective in challenging contexts. However there is little research into how leaders go about encouraging and implementing support for a focus on enhanced learning in challenging schools, in particular, identifying processes that successful leaders use to develop attitudinal and behavioural transformations.

School leaders building capacity at the school, community and regional level

Research on leadership and school effectiveness has moved away from concentrating on individual leaders to focus on systems, organisations and groups. Key questions for future research therefore are:

- how school-leaders can build capacity and successful learning organisations; and
- what contextual structures will optimise the process?

There is agreement that leadership influences on schools occur at multiple levels, including within schools and at district, regional, and state levels. Direct effects of district or regional levels of leadership on student and school outcomes have proven very complex to investigate. However Leithwood, Louis, Anderson and Wahlstrom, (2004) found that leadership at these levels influences school performance indirectly through the provision of professional development opportunities for teachers and the alignment of school priorities across the district or region.

Whilst the organisation of schools is important for learning, quality school leaders also placed an emphasis on making the school’s physical environment exciting, inviting and welcoming. Castagnoli and Cook (2004) provided an account of the influence of school leaders on the visual presentation of a school to its community. Successful leaders wanted their school to be a place where the students, teachers, parents and community wanted to be.

3.3 Professional practices of quality school leadership

Quality school leadership is contextual, contingent and shared across school members. Quality school leaders develop and maintain core values as they negotiate dilemmas and tensions in their leadership and selectively implement core professional practices.

Although an abundance of typologies of leadership strategies have been articulated and popularised, they are complex with considerable overlaps and tensions. It is more useful to focus on leadership in action rather than on typologies as it is more likely to produce precise descriptions of the core professional practices of leaders. In this section, evidence on leadership strategies has been differentiated by the emphasis placed on the goals, core tasks and practices of leaders, the organisational structures that leaders establish and the relationships leaders encourage.

School leadership can be carried out in many different ways, and the research literature indicates that this is both possible and desirable (Bush & Glover, 2003; Leithwood, Jantzi & Steinbach, 1999; Leithwood, Steinbach & Jantzi, 2002). Leadership strategies were found to be dependent on the individual, the extended and immediate context and the goals being pursued. The research depicts leadership as a process of negotiating dilemmas and provides evidence that teachers and principals practise more contingent, pluralistic forms of leadership, often team-based and collegial.

![Figure 3.5: Professional practices of quality school leadership](image-url)
3.3.1 Core practices of leadership

Synthesis of large-scale quantitative research into school leadership led Leithwood and Riehl (2003) to identify a set of ‘basic’ practices (Table 3.3). Leithwood’s (2005) summation of the evidence in the eight country case studies in the ISSP project did not challenge the conclusions from the earlier research. Rather, it identified the ways in which the core practices were adapted to contexts in order to achieve their desired effects. It is reasonable to conclude that quality school leadership practices have to be highly adaptable and contingent in their specific applications.

Table 3.3 Quality school leadership practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setting directions</th>
<th>Fostering the acceptance of group goals</th>
<th>Creating high performance expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developing people</td>
<td>Offering intellectual stimulation</td>
<td>Providing individualised support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-designing the organisation</td>
<td>Strengthening school cultures</td>
<td>Modifying organisational structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Building collaborative processes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Spillane, Halverson and Diamond (2004) studied leaders’ traits, cognition and behaviours; to conceptualise leadership as an integrated practice. They found that the practice of leadership was stretched over leaders, followers and the material and symbolic artefacts of schools. Empirical research from the UK, USA and Australia finds successful school leaders in challenging schools employ a range of policies and practices to meet the education needs of challenging schools, but focus on a few commonalities:

- maintaining expectations for, and promoting powerful and engaging forms of, teaching and learning (Fair Go Team, 2006; Gurr; Drysdale & Mulford, 2005; Hayes, Christie, Mills & Lingard, 2004; Lingard, Hayes & Mills, 2002; Leithwood, Steinbach & Jantzi, 2002; Leithwood & Riehl, 2003; Taylor-Moore, 2004);
- developing and supporting a culture of education in families through home-school linkages, parent education programs, and school-linked, integrated social services (Fair Go Team, 2006; Leithwood & Riehl, 2003; Leithwood, Steinbach & Jantzi, 2002; Mulford and Silins, 2003) and
- supporting the value placed by schools on students’ social and cultural capital (Fair Go Team, 2006; Leithwood & Riehl, 2003; Leithwood, Steinbach & Jantzi, 2002).

More specifically, evidence indicated that effective leaders:

- developed a school mission and goals and distributed the work of realising the goals (Day, Harris & Hadfield, 2001; Gurr; Drysdale & Mulford, 2005);
- promoted a school culture of trust, support, collaboration and legitimate risk-taking (Fouts, 2003; Harris & Chapman, 2002; Leithwood, 2005; Silins & Mulford, 2002);
- facilitated school structures that involved the school community in shared decision-making and collective actions based on shared values, norms and understandings (Fouts, 2003; Gurr; Drysdale & Mulford, 2005; Leithwood, 2005; Silins & Mulford, 2002); and
- maintained high standards of professionalism and involvement in the core business of the school—teaching and learning (Harris & Chapman, 2002; Leithwood, 2005; Silins & Mulford, 2002).

Future research on school leadership might move away from investigating traits, cognitions and behaviours of individual leaders or small teams to study leaders in action at the level of the school community.

3.3.2 Leadership strategies

Instructional, pedagogical or educative leadership

Instructional, pedagogical or educative leadership takes as its focus the central tasks of schools, namely teaching and learning. School leaders exhibiting instructional leadership assume responsibility for the professional development of teachers, the learning outcomes of the students and the deployment of resources associated with the realisation of these goals (Benson, 2002; Bush & Glover, 2003). In-depth case study research in UK shows that these leaders:

- demonstrated credibility as both teacher and administrator (Benson, 2002; Webb, 2005);
- developed and modelled a range of approaches to teaching and learning (Benson, 2002; Southworth & Weindling, 2002);
- encouraged professional dialogue, discussion and initiative-taking (Southworth & Weindling, 2002; Webb, 2005);
- used professional collaboration and staff expertise as a basis for school improvement (Benson, 2002; Webb, 2005); and
- managed the workload, well-being and professional development of teachers (Webb, 2005).
Educative leadership has been found to be central to the improvement of students’ social and academic outcomes (Hayes, Lingard & Mills, 2000; Robinson, 2005). However, in their study of 15 effective teachers in eight disadvantaged schools in Australia, Crowther, Kaagan, Ferguson and Hann (2002) concluded that instructional leadership should not be the predominant role of principals—rather it is an important role for teacher-leaders. Schools improved when principals and teacher-leaders worked in parallel, each assuming complementary but distinct responsibilities.

Managerial leadership
Managerial leadership encompasses a particular private-industry ethos. It treats the management of the key functions and tasks of schools, including the behaviours of school personnel, in the same way as profit-making businesses are operated. The literature reported that there was agreement that some forms of management and administration responsibilities were core responsibilities of successful school leaders, necessary to ensure the smooth operation and implementation of a school’s vision and strategies (Bush & Glover, 2003). The research reported that in the past few decades principals have increased the percentage of time consumed with managerial responsibilities and accountability (Blackmore, 2004; Leithwood, Louis, Anderson & Wahlstrom, 2004). Current evidence indicates that successful school leadership requires management, administration and particular leadership skills (Day, Harris & Hadfield, 2001; Duignan, 2003; Gronn & Hamilton, 2004; Hayes, Mills, Lingard & Christie, 2002).

Transductive or transactional leadership
‘Transductive’ or ‘transactional’ leadership has a relational focus: a follower complies (through effort, productivity and loyalty) in exchange for expected rewards (Bush & Glover, 2003). In transactional leadership both the leader and the followers achieve interdependent goals (Barnett & McCormick, 2002). The leader usually monitors the followers (teachers) to ensure mistakes are not made but also to intervene when things go wrong. In multi-level modelling of transformational and transactional leaders, Barnett, Marsh and Craven (2005) found that leaders’ individual caring behaviours were significant in eliciting teachers’ satisfaction and in enhancing their morale. Similarly, Barnett and McCormick’s (2002) qualitative study of four large secondary schools in NSW found that leaders’ individual concerns and support for staff increased the teachers’ perceptions of successful school leadership, be it transactional or transformational leadership.

Transformational leadership
Transformational leaders usually have charisma and vision, as well as a concern for relationships (Ryan, 2002). However, Barnett and McCormick’s (2002) comparative investigation of leadership found that while transformational leaders were deemed effective by teachers, the value of the leaders’ vision was overestimated as it had little influence on teachers’ actions or students’ learning. They found that the leader’s vision needed to be grounded in the practicalities of everyday schooling otherwise followers viewed it as unrealistic.

Transformational leadership has been found to involve leaders and followers uniting to pursue higher level common goals (Barnett, Marsh & Craven, 2005; Bush & Glover, 2003; Webb, 2005):

- Day, Harris and Hadfield’s (2001) research found that successful principals were both transactional (by ensuring that systems were maintained so that their school ran smoothly) and also transformational (in so far as they built on the esteem, competence, autonomy and achievement of staff);
- Leithwood, Steinbach and Jantzi’s (2002) qualitative study of five secondary schools in Ontario found transformational leaders were effective in assisting in policy development and change in schools. They drew on strategies such as helping to clarify the reasons for implementing policy changes and set about skilling teachers to participate in decisions about policy actions;
- Silins and Mulford’s (2002) modelling found that successful school leaders employ transformational leadership practices but work collaboratively, directly and indirectly through others; and
- Ryan (2002) provided evidence to demonstrate that transformational leadership that worked collectively with others was more effective in catering for contexts of diversity.

Interpersonal or emotional leadership
Interpersonal leaders placed a high premium upon personal values and relationships with others (Harris & Chapman, 2002; West-Burnham, 2001). Studies of these school leaders have reported that their individual considerations and interpersonal qualities were significant (Barnett, Marsh & Craven, 2005; Barnett & McCormick, 2002; Day, Harris & Hadfield, 2001; Leithwood, Steinbach & Jantzi, 2002; Wood, 2002; the Hay Group, 2000).

As well as interpersonal skills, these school leaders possess emotional intelligence. Harris and Chapman (2002) reported that emotionally intelligent school leaders were found to place a premium on the quality of relationships. They invested in individuals as much as in systems or structures. Hollingsworth’s (2004) comparative study of ten successful leaders in Tasmania and England found that they exhibited emotional leadership. All of the leaders emphasised the importance of developing greater understanding of their own and their staff’s emotional needs.
Moral leadership

Moral leadership has been found to focus on values and beliefs that give schools a sense of purpose (Bush & Glover, 2003). Studies in England reported that successful leaders mediated externally-generated accountability pressures to uphold values, implementing measures that were consistent with what the school was trying to achieve (Bush & Glover, 2003). Fullan (2002) argued that sustained improvement of schools did not occur unless the whole school was moving forward and acting with moral purpose. Such moral purpose included sharing knowledge and working towards closing gaps between high and low performing students and schools.

Contingent and contextual leadership

There was agreement across the studies that no one leadership strategy can meet the diverse challenges found in schools facing difficult circumstances. While all the aforementioned leadership strategies are important, they account for only part of what successful school leadership means. Current evidence supports the premise that successful leadership is both contextual and contingent. Quality leaders employed strategies based on their assessments of the setting, the character of the social organisation, the goals being pursued, the individuals involved, the resources and timeframes available, and their own characteristics as leaders (Hallinger & Heck, 1996; Leithwood 2005; Leithwood & Riehl, 2003; Mulford & Silins, 2003).

When a challenging situation arose, quality school leaders employed a range of strategies according to the issue, their assessment of extended and immediate contextual factors, and the stage of school development. This was a key finding from a range of studies including Wasserman-Warnet and Klein’s (2000) investigation of 20 Israeli schools, Taylor-Moore’s (2004) study of 18 head-teachers in schools in England, Harris and Chapman’s (2002) study of ten schools facing difficult circumstances in England and Scott’s (2003) study of 322 principals in New South Wales. Harris (2004) reported that, in working contingently, principals adopted autocratic styles at critical times but moved to more distributive and transformational styles when wanting to take their schools forward.

Staff experience and expertise also influences the leadership practices employed. For example, Spillane, Halverson and Diamond (2004) reported that a task-oriented strategy was effective when teachers have limited experience and competence. A blend of task- and relationship-oriented strategies worked with mature groups. Delegating leadership appeared effective when working with more mature groups.

Dilemmas and quality school leadership

Not all accounts of quality school leadership have been able to contain or adequately reflect the complexities, dilemmas and tensions which characterise the working lives of education leaders (Day, Harris & Hadfield, 2001; Duignan, 2003; Wildy & Louden, 2000). By definition:

- dilemmas are choices between two potentially desirable courses of action which were to a greater or lesser extent mutually exclusive, such as whether to professionally develop or dismiss unsatisfactory staff; and
- tensions are specific sets of pressures experienced by leaders in certain contexts involving choices which were not necessarily mutually exclusive, such as balancing leadership roles with management responsibilities.

Leaders in any organisation experience tensions between competing elements of leadership, management and administration. In the UK (Mulford & Johns, 2004) as in Australia (Duignan, 2003) leaders of frontline service organisations, such as schools, face dilemmas and tensions that involve people, contested values and ethical contradictions. In the UK, Day, Harris and Hadfield, (2001) found that when quality school leaders managed the dilemmas and tensions of change they showed themselves as people-centred experts with core values that permeated their thinking and actions and allowed them to make ‘tough decisions’. Day, Harris, Hadfield, Tolley and Beresford (2000) termed the skills and attributes necessary to do this as the exercising of ‘values-led contingency’ leadership.

Competing values positions were also found in both the tensions that Duignan (2003) identified from evidence generated by the SOLR Project, and in the dilemmas found in Wildy and Louden’s (2000) school restructuring study. Several of the tensions and dilemmas in these studies overlap with those identified in the research by Day Harris, Hadfield, Tolley and Beresford (2000). The ways in which quality school leaders manage dilemmas and tensions in varying situations is an area for future research.

3.3.3 Leadership organisation

Strategic leadership

Davies and Davies (2004) found that the style of leadership implemented is not as important as the ability of the leaders to operate strategically to ensure the sustainability and effectiveness of their schools over the longer term. They found that the development of both organisational and individual characteristics were significant in strategic leadership. Specifically:

- the organisational characteristics comprised configuring strategic orientation, translating strategy into action, aligning people and the organisation, determining effective intervention points and developing strategic competencies in the school; and
- the individual characteristics were found to comprise restlessness with the present, a high adaptive capacity, wisdom and interpersonal skills.
Distributive, participative or democratic leadership

Given both the complexities of school leadership and the need for capacity building within them, research evidence supports the need for sharing of leadership (Mulford & Johns, 2004; Mulford & Silins, 2003; Spillane, Halverson & Diamond, 2004; Storey, 2004). Most current research acknowledges that quality school leadership is not contained within a solo leader who is assigned a formal position of power and authority within an organisational hierarchy; rather it is distributed across people in the organisation (Gronn, 2000; Harris 2004, 2004b; Harris & Chapman, 2002; Leithwood & Riehl, 2003; Spillane, Halverson & Diamond, 2004; Ryan, 2002; York-Barr & Duke, 2004). There is also a growing trend in the leadership research to focus on the collective capacity of leadership that is practised at multiple levels rather than the behaviours of individual leaders.

Distributive leaders have been found to actively, deliberately and conscientiously involve teachers, professionals, parents, community members and students in leadership roles in a school (Gronn, 2000; Harris 2004; 2004b). They distribute responsibility throughout the school to increase school effectiveness, albeit without abrogating their responsibility for providing demonstrable leadership through high levels of productivity and providing models of excellence in performance. Distributive leadership is not the same as delegation, and it is quickly evident when it is a ruse used to mask incompetence, inefficiency or ineffectiveness. The substitute leader takes complete responsibility for a specified action required without being given directions from the principal, while the principal performs their duties to the highest level of proficiency.

A substantial body of research has found that sharing power with others in school communities has positive effects on teachers’ self-esteem, morale and absenteeism, and on instructional, professional and organisational practices, as well as on overall school capacity and effectiveness (Harris & Chapman, 2002; Harris & Mujs, 2004; Leithwood & Riehl, 2003; Sachs, 1997; Taylor-Moore, 2004; Woods, 2002; York-Barr & Duke, 2004). For instance, Sergiovani (2005) found that the sharing of power benefits leaders by increasing the school’s overall organisational capacity. It also replenished leaders and provided them with access to the innovative ideas of others.

While consistent leadership can assist school change and improve the quality of its teaching, Castagnoli and Cook (2004) reported that the head-teachers in their study indicated benefits leaders by increasing the school’s overall organisational capacity. It also replenished leaders and provided them with access to the innovative ideas of others.

Parallel leadership

Several research studies have delineated a specialised form of distributive leadership termed ‘parallel’ leadership or co-principalship. Using evidence collected from eight disadvantaged schools in Australia, Crowther, Kaagan, Ferguson and Hann (2002) found that principals assume responsibility for strategic leadership such as visioning, aligning resources and networking, while teachers assume primary responsibility for pedagogical or instructional leadership.

Research from Queensland schools involved in the longitudinal Innovative Design for Enhancing Achievements in Schools (IDEAS) project reported positive findings regarding the effectiveness of parallel leadership for the revitalisation of their schools (Andrews & Associates, 2005; Lewis, 2005; Ng, Jeyaraj, Pei, Lee, Goh, & Chew, 2005).

Co-principalship

‘Shared principalships’ have been investigated as an organisational structure to de-intensify the increasing demands and complexities of the principal’s role (Scott, 2003). Gronn and Hamilton (2004) reported positive results from a six year co-principalship in a Victorian Catholic girls’ secondary school. It was found that whilst co-principalship eased the workload and improved overall organisational capability, success relied heavily on the two individuals having the capacity to build a workable relationship. Gronn and Hamilton (2004) also reported the success of ‘shared role space’ or dual authority, but cautioned that shared leadership or co-principalship may be vulnerable in non-accepting school cultures. The gender and appointment issues that were identified suggest the need for further careful investigation of co-principalship.

Teachers as leaders

Research into quality school leadership has identified the importance of instructional, participative, distributed or parallel leadership, and in particular the value of teacher leadership. York-Barr and Duke (2004) reported that the success of teacher leadership is dependent on the principal’s active support and on the alignment of structures and resources to encourage such work.

Harris and Mujs’s (2004) case studies of ten UK schools identified positive impacts of teacher-leaders and their development within schools. They found that the sense of ownership and involvement inherent in the teacher leadership position led to:

• positive feelings of self-worth, increased self-esteem and work satisfaction among the teacher-leaders;
• higher levels of performance;
• decreasing teacher absenteeism and increased teacher retention; and
• improved student outcomes.

The small-scale, school-based reforms introduced by teacher-leaders progressed more slowly, but were more generally accepted and implemented by staff. York-Barr and Duke (2004) similarly reported positive effects of teacher leadership, finding that the teacher-leaders themselves developed increased understanding of instructional, professional and organisational practices.

Both York-Barr and Duke (2004) and Harris and Muijs (nd) identified several barriers to and consequences of teacher leadership. These included:
• egalitarian values among teachers which militated against them presenting themselves as leaders;
• fear of being ostracised by colleagues or experiencing a loss of connectedness with peers;
• top-down management structures in schools; and
• lack of trust amongst staff.

A survey of 42 teacher-leaders also found that the amount of time spent on leadership roles detracted from the time they spent with students.

To facilitate teacher leadership Harris and Muijs (nd) reported that teacher-leaders needed time to meet, plan and discuss issues, as well as system-level support, professional development, remuneration and reward. There is a need for more evidence regarding teacher-leaders and their effects on students and on building school capacity.

There is need for more empirical evidence about the relative success of pluralistic leadership strategies. Research that focuses on leaders in action would be useful. Such future research could investigate how flexibility and contexts affect various leadership strategies.

3.3.4 Promoting schools as learning organisations

Researchers have found that the shared potential of schools is enhanced when they are viewed as learning organisations with teachers working as professional communities involved in ongoing, reflective learning that complements students’ learning (Silins & Mulford, 2002). Capacity building and the development of the school as a collaborative learning community has been linked to positive school effects and student outcomes (Silins & Mulford, 2002; see also Section 3.2.2).

Building capacity and collaboration

As schools have developed as learning communities or professional learning alliances—as communities of knowledge generating and transmitting practices—principals have developed collaborative relationships with teachers and within their school communities (Hollingsworth, 2004; Martoo, 2005). Quality leaders:
• demonstrate values of respect, reciprocity and collaboration, and facilitate these amongst others (Sachs, 2001);
• promote learning communities through organising professional learning teams, involving others in decision-making, respecting teachers’ professional autonomy, and empowering teachers with the responsibility and authority to lead (Barnett & McCormick, 2002; Harris & Chapman, 2002); and
• develop learning cultures through establishing zero tolerance for low standards (Castagnoli & Cook, 2004), raising teacher and parent expectations about students’ social and academic outcomes, and facilitating professional dialogues around teaching and learning (Hayes, Christie, Mills & Lingard, 2004; Kugelmass, 2003; Woods, 2002).

Quality school leaders have expertise in building school and community capacity and collegiality (Day, Harris & Hadfield, 2001; Gurr, Drysdale, Di Natale, Ford, Hardy & Swann, 2003). They work with and through teachers, parents and community members to develop systems and structures that promote the school as a learning organisation and improve students’ schooling (Gurr, Drysdale & Mulford, 2005; Harris 2004, 2004b; Mulford & Johns, 2004; Silins & Mulford, 2002). For example:
• From their case studies for the International Successful School Principalship Project (ISSP) research project Gurr, Drysdale, Di Natale, Ford, Hardy and Swann (2003) found that school capacity had a direct impact on teaching and learning with a positive consequence for students’ academic self-concept and their scholastic participation, engagement and retention.
• Similarly, in their model-building and path analysis in the LOLSO project, Mulford and Silins (2003) established that when leaders promoted organisational learning they influenced teachers’ instruction and interactions with students and increased students’ perceptions of teachers’ work as well as their academic self-concepts, participation and engagement in school.
• The type of leadership found to facilitate organisational learning was transformational and distributed. The modelling in the LOLSO project identified that when schools form partnerships with parents a ‘powerful alliance for achieving educational outcomes’ is created (Silins & Mulford, 2002, p604).

The quality school leaders in both the QSRLS case studies and the LOLSO project promoted the features of professional learning communities and distributed leadership, and gave matters of pedagogy and learning priority in the school’s leadership practices (Hayes, Christie, Mills and Lingard, 2004;
professional development outcomes of school principals and knowledge sharing in New York reported on the positive results, however, were contingent upon cooperative organisational arrangements being made by leaders at school and district or regional levels. Fullan (2002) reported that the mentoring of new principals by more senior principals benefited from ‘inter-visitations’ of groups of teachers and principals to other schools to observe specific instructional practices as well as monthly meetings. Ackerman, Ventimiglia and Juchniewicz (2002) provided evidence that expertise in instructional leadership, rather than time in a leadership role, was an important quality of successful mentors.

Building vision

Nearly all schools have a vision or mission. It has been found to provide direction for the school, draw people together around common purpose and goals, and to engender confidence and enthusiasm amongst stakeholders (Barnett & McCormick, 2002; Castognoli & Cook, 2004; Gurr; Drysdale, Di Natale, Ford, Hardy & Swann, 2003; Harris & Chapman, 2002; Hollingsworth, 2004; Quicke, 2000; Grove, 2004; Taylor-Moore, 2004; the Hay Group, 2000). Identifying and articulating a vision so as to set directions is identified as part of core leadership practice (Leithwood & Riehl, 2003; see Table 3.3 in Section 3.3.1). A study of 12 Australian schools found that 97% of parents and 99% of teachers expect the principal to express his/her vision clearly, while 98% of both groups expect him/her to plan strategically to achieve that vision (Bush & Glover, 2003).

Fullan (1992) found that vision-building was a highly sophisticated, dynamic process that few organisations sustain. Studies showed that vision statements need to be grounded, realistic and achievable (Barnett & McCormick, 2002). Further research is needed to see if vision and goals are better developed in a democratic, inclusive way with the principal acting as a catalyst. A synthesis of 20 years of research by Leithwood and Riehl (2003) has led them to conclude that there is debate about whether vision and goals are better to be collaboratively developed, or introduced and championed by leaders. Evidence indicated that visions typically reflect the core values and beliefs of the formal leader; but need to be derived from those shared amongst all stakeholders (Day, Harris & Hadfield, 2001; Gurr; Drysdale, Di Natale, Ford, Hardy & Swann, 2003). In times of change, these values inform the leadership approach adopted by the principals and the decisions they make (Day, Harris & Hadfield, 2001; Taylor-Moore, 2004). Several studies have found that visions are usefully developed in collaboration with the whole school community (Barnett & McCormick 2002; Castognoli & Cook 2004; Hollingsworth, 2004; Quicke, 2000; Taylor-Moore, 2004).

More research on how to build leadership capacity within and across schools is warranted. In particular, more evidence of the effects of leadership mentoring and networking programs is needed.
3.4 Attributes and capabilities of quality school leaders

Quality school leaders possess a range of personal, relational, organisational and professional attributes, plus the capabilities to employ these effectively in complex and changing circumstances. Quality school leadership is sustainable when it is shared and developed across the school community.

A complex array of attributes and capabilities of quality school leaders has been identified in the research literature, much of it identified through interview and survey methodologies. The extensive lists of characteristics of quality school leaders reflect the diversity and complexities within the role (Day, Harris & Hadfield, 2001; Gurr; Drysdale & Mulford, 2005; Louden & Wildy, 1999; Wildy & Louden, 2000). Analysis of these lists shows they include value-based attributes, such as caring, innate goodness, fairness, other-centredness and honesty, as well as skill-based attributes such as being a good communicator; having an inclusive style with high expectations, being hands-on and being a good decision maker. The research literature acknowledges that capabilities are what leaders bring to their role, affecting the ways they approach their role and their performances (Duignan, 2003; Hay Group, 2000).

Individual leaders vary in their attributes and employment of capabilities, but there is agreement that success in leadership is dependent on the ability to integrate and employ various attributes and capabilities in the face of differing tasks and contexts. Challenging circumstances in particular may identify effective leaders. From the SOLR research, Duignan, Kelleher and Spry (2003) identified capable leaders as those most likely to be successful in providing influential leadership in times of uncertainty and change. Capable leaders possess leadership knowledge and skills plus the confidence to develop and employ these effectively in complex and changing circumstances.

The literature also reports the results of investigations into whether the practices, attributes and capabilities of quality school leaders can be learned, particularly given the strong value-base of many of these qualities (fig. 3.5). This section summarises some of the research on the personal, relational, organisational and professional qualities and capabilities of leaders. The qualities and capabilities that are identified are not exhaustive, but represent a synthesis of relevant research.

3.4.1 Personal

Passion and commitment

Not surprisingly passion and commitment to students, education, school and community, including a desire for the success of all students, have been found to be key attributes of quality school leaders (Barnett & McCormick, 2002; Castagnoli & Cook, 2004; Day, 2004; Duignan, 2003; Grove, 2004; Kugelman, 2003; Leithwood, 2005; Leithwood & Riehl, 2003; Taylor-Moore, 2004; Woods, 2002). Even under difficult, challenging circumstances quality school leaders express enthusiasm and commitment to their students, to education and to schools. They believe that who they are and how they lead can make a difference to the lives of staff, students, parents and the community (Leithwood, 2005; Leithwood & Riehl, 2003; Taylor-Moore, 2004; Woods, 2002).

As well as passion, terms such as ‘enchanted’ (Woods, 2002), ‘innovative’ (Taylor-Moore, 2004), ‘motivated’ (Grove, 2004) and ‘committed’ (Barnett & McCormick, 2002; Castagnoli & Cook, 2004; Kugelman, 2003; Leithwood, Steinbach & Jantzi, 2002; Taylor-Moore, 2004) have been used in the research literature to represent evidence of the same motivating force. However, it was questioned as to whether ‘passion’ and ‘commitment’ described the same attributes. For example, Day (2004) found that ‘commitment’ did not encapsulate the same attributes that teachers and school community members used when they characterised principals as ‘passionate.’ In the ISSP studies, the values of social justice and equity were found to underpin the passion, enthusiasm, persistence and optimism expressed by the successful leaders (Leithwood, 2005). More fine grained research would establish what comprises passion and robust hope, whether leadership can be learned, and how it might be developed and expressed in diverse leadership roles.


**Personally reflective**

Quality school leaders demonstrate the capacity for critical reflection and engage in reflective practice (Gurr; Drysdale & Mulford, 2005; Harris & Chapman, 2002; Hollingsworth, 2004; Taylor-Moore, 2004; Wildy & Wallace, 1998). Hollingsworth (2004) reported that principals described themselves as professionals who modelled reflective practice and wanted their staff to develop the skills for reflection and evaluation. Gurr; Drysdale and Mulford’s (2005) case studies of principals in Tasmania and Victoria found that they critically reflected on their values and actions, and also facilitated monitoring, reflection and evaluation of others through school governance structures and school-wide professional learning.

**3.4.2 Relational**

**Professional support and mentorship**

Principals have ultimate responsibility for the teaching and learning focus of the school, as well as the professional development and well-being of teachers. Research has identified quality leaders as demonstrating capabilities for supporting and working with the strengths and weaknesses of staff, enhancing their staff’s sense of self-worth, and supporting structures and resources that promote their staff’s development (Castagnoli & Cook, 2004; Halverson 2004; Scott, 2003). For instance, Harris and Chapman (2004) found that this capability involved knowing how to use a combination of pressure, support and tactful actions to encourage teachers’ efforts in innovative thinking. Successful strategies used in providing professional support included investing in staff development and providing time for teachers to discuss teaching and to observe colleagues (Harris & Chapman, 2004; Hayes, Christie, Mills & Lingard, 2004), and acting as a mentor (Taylor-Moore, 2004; Woods, 2002).

**Trust**

Trust is a quality that demonstrates confidence in the behaviour of another person, group or institution. It is the social glue that binds individuals and groups together for the purposes of action (Groundwater-Smith & Sachs, 2002).

- Harris and Chapman (2002) identified that trust in the school leader by the school community was as important as the trust shown by the teachers.
- Several researchers identified quality leaders as having a trusting disposition (Dugnan, 2003) plus the capability of modelling and developing trust within the school community (Harris & Chapman, 2002; Sergiovanni, 2005; Taylor-Moore, 2004).
- Day’s (2004) study found that the creation of a climate in which the head ‘trusts you implicitly and will let you deal with things’ was a key quality of leadership valued by teachers. Being trusted enhanced teachers’ motivation and helped to build and sustain participative school community relationships.
- Further, drawing on quantitative modelling from the LOLSO research project, Mulford and Silins (2003) found that developing a trusting, collaborative climate was the initial step in developing collective teacher efficacy and embarking on school improvement.
- Similarly, Sergiovanni (2005) found that relational trust was the catalyst for developing a supportive work culture, positive orientations towards change, and improvements in student learning outcomes.

**Emotional intelligence**

Drawing on research into professional and vocational competence, Scott (2003) identified capable leaders as having high levels of personal, social and emotional intelligence. Emotional intelligence included capabilities such as being able to remain calm, maintain a sense of humour and perspective, be able to bounce back from adversity, and have an ability to make difficult decisions. Other capabilities that indicated emotional intelligence included being able to deal effectively with conflict situations, a willingness to listen to different points of view before coming to a decision, and being able to contribute positively to team-based projects. Scott (2003) identified emotional intelligence as a key high-order capability of principals.

Several studies have identified the importance of emotional intelligence for working within the school and its community (Harris & Chapman, 2002; Hollingsworth, 2004; Kugelmass, 2003; Woods, 2002). The Hay Group (2000) identified 15 characteristics of excellence in head-teachers, two of which included understanding others and appreciating one’s impact and influence. These are emotional intelligence capabilities that involve showing value for and respecting others, as well as understanding and appreciating the expertise of others.

**Interpersonal care and integrity**

Studies of principals indicated those who demonstrate quality school leadership developed positive relationships (Hayes, Christie, Mills & Lingard, 2004), respected others (Hay Group, 2000), had good interpersonal skills (Day, Harris & Hadfield, 2001; Scott, 2003) and were good communicators (Gurr; Drysdale & Mulford, 2005; Leithwood, 2005). As well as valuing and practising personal relationship skills, quality school leaders knew their staff’s potentials, their plans and aspirations and provided them with assistance in working towards their goals (Castagnoli & Cook, 2004; Gurr; Drysdale & Mulford, 2005; Hollingsworth, 2004). Successful leaders also recognised staff members’ issues and offered crisis support, supporting them in change processes. They also acknowledged the efforts of staff (Castagnoli & Cook, 2004). Development of rapport with staff can be assisted through good induction programs, as shown in studies of leadership by Grove (2004) and Castagnoli and Cook (2004).
3.4.3 Organisational

Manages well

From the 1980s onwards much emphasis has been given to the management capabilities of school principals, perhaps becoming the overarching concept of leaders since that time (Bush & Glover, 2003). Across the literature, management capabilities have been identified as enhancing schools’ effectiveness for students, teachers and community (Gurr, Drysdale, Di Natale, Ford, Hardy & Swann, 2003). While Hayes, Christie, Mills and Lingard (2004) found that principals were not the only ones responsible for leadership in their school, they were ultimately responsible for the development of structures that provided a supportive environment for encouraging others to take on responsibility and ensure the smooth running of the school. Research reports that being managerially adept and having generic managerial knowledge and skills are necessary for maintaining clear directions, systems, expectations and roles that support development and understanding by all stakeholders (Castagnoli & Cook, 2004; Grove, 2004; Kugelmass, 2003).

Contextually aware

Quality school leaders were found to be able to read and understand the environment, especially their extended and immediate contexts (Hay Group, 2000), to think contingently and to assess likely consequences (Scott, 2003). This contextual awareness (Duignan, 2003) enabled the leaders to differentiate priorities, to make strategic decisions and to draw on supportive resources. It was found to involve an understanding of the internal and external school environments as well as the capacity to be adaptive and to know when to involve others and when to take individual action (Gurr, Drysdale, Di Natale, Ford, Hardy & Swann, 2003).

Research has shown that quality school leaders have knowledge of external supports and resources they can draw upon to manage school practices, promote improvement and support school goals (Castagnoli & Cook, 2004). Skills in developing positive relationships with other schools and leaders through inter-school visits have also been found to be valuable in this regard (Taylor-Moore, 2004).

The Queensland case studies conducted by Hayes, Christie, Mills and Lingard (2004) found quality school leaders were cognisant of extended and immediate contextual factors such as departmental policies and directives but did not feel unduly bound by them. In particular, expert leaders were distinguished from novices by their ability to understand the local school community plus the broader economic, political and policy contexts. They were able to balance competing priorities, decide directions and use strategies that maintained positive relationships with their school communities (Ansell, 2004; Halverson, 2004; Hollingsworth, 2004; Taylor-Moore, 2004; Woods, 2002). For example, Harris and Chapman (2002) found that contextual awareness involved consciousness of the school as part of, rather than apart from, multiple extended and immediate communities.

Strategic thinking

Both Duignan (2003) and Scott (2003) identified strategic ways of thinking as important capabilities for school-leaders. Several studies found evidence of this capability in the ways that leaders balanced external contextual pressures for change with core school values and vision when deciding their actions (Day, Harris & Hadfield, 2001; Hayes, Christie, Mills, & Lingard, 2004).

Problem solving

Quality school leaders take calculated legitimate risks and encourage others to do so also (Castagnoli & Cook, 2004; Grove, 2004; Martoo, 2005). For example, Sergiovanni (2005) found that quality school leaders displayed personal integrity and trust and provided the conditions in which teachers can try something new. In five of the country reports of the ISSP study successful leaders were found to be ‘cognitively flexible’ (Leithwood, 2005). That is, they demonstrated open-mindedness and willingness to listen to the ideas of others, as well as creative, critical lateral thinking while solving problems.

Quality school leaders solve problems and use conflict-resolution skills, many of which can be learned. The Hay Group (2000) reported that analytical thinking was important in this regard as it involved the ability to think logically, break things down, identify cause and effect, pre-empt or anticipate negative events, and drive initiatives. Some of these attributes are not readily learned through direct instruction but may be enhanced through shared experiential learning. Scott (2003) and Halverson (2004) found that the use of diagnostic skills enabled expert leaders to assess novel situations that cannot, by definition, be specified in advance.

Harnessing change

Several studies report that quality school leaders have the capability to positively manage change (Duignan, 2003; Storey, 2004; Woods, 2002). For example, Leithwood, Steinbach and Jantzi (2002) described this capability as ‘authentic policy implementation’. This capability included being selective about external and internal pressures and choosing those which best suit the school’s goals (Grove, 2004; Hargreaves & Fink, 2003; Hayes, Christie, Mills, & Lingard, 2004). For instance, Sergiovanni (2005) found that leadership inevitably involved change, which inevitably involved learning. Further, leadership involved helping teachers to understand the problems that schools faced, and to either manage the necessary changes or learn to live with them. Quality leaders therefore, were those who responded positively to change, learned from it and assisted others to do likewise.

Maintaining student and staff morale, as well as improving teaching and learning in school, have been found to be the
focus of effective strategies by successful leaders (Day, Harris, Hadfield, Tolley & Beresford, 2000), Leithwood (2005) reported on 63 cases of successful school leadership within contexts of high stakes national accountability in Australia, Canada, China, Denmark, England, Norway, Sweden and the USA. The accountability initiatives significantly shaped the practices of the leaders in the schools in these studies. Those who were more successful were found to be less worried about the negative effects of changes. Where external pressures impacted on schools, these leaders were selective about the internal and external pressures they responded to, and were able to harness some of these pressures (such as government accountability measures) to serve their schools’ priorities.

Similarly, Day’s (2005) ten case studies of successful leaders in challenging schools in the UK found that they accepted their responsibility to do the best they could for their students in terms of the government testing and attainment agendas, whilst also maintaining a commitment to more holistic visions for education.

3.4.4 Professional qualities and the role of frameworks

The professional development of leaders

Successful professional development programs for education leaders include the use of coaching, mentoring, networking, inter-visitations, and reflective portfolios (APAPDC, 2005; Fullan, 2002; 2005; Scott, 2003; Wildy & Wallace, 1998). These programs are based on research that leadership strategies can be learned, albeit not in single off-the-job courses, but rather through more active, enduring means. Several researchers and state and national education bodies have developed frameworks based on empirical studies that capture broad operative domains of school leadership. Within these they have delineated key attributes, capabilities and standards of effective leaders. Based upon these frameworks, implications for the recruitment and professional development of leaders have been proposed.

The role and impact of standards for leadership

Leadership standards have become a prominent feature in the education context in most state and territory education systems throughout Australia and in countries such as the USA, the UK and New Zealand. Developed by state and nationally-based education departments and/or peak professional leadership groups, the frameworks draw upon theories and findings from empirical studies to identify knowledge, skills, performances and dispositions that the profession believes its leaders should possess and exhibit. Across the range of contexts in which leadership standards frameworks have been developed, the common intent has been to improve student achievement by improving the quality of school leadership.

The frameworks can be used:

- to clarify the expectations of leaders;
- to offer guidance for improving the practices of both current and prospective school leaders;
- as a base for professional learning programs and for promoting the profession in the extended public context (APAPDC, 2005);
- as bases for performance evaluation systems; and/or
- in the recruitment, selection and credentia ling of leaders (Leithwood, Jantzi & Steinbach, 2002b).

They assume that the knowledge, skills and values associated with leadership capabilities can be learned and that the frameworks provide leaders, and those aspiring to be leaders, with resources for developing quality capacity building programs.

Scott’s (2003) analysis of the surveys of 322 principals in NSW schools showed that principals ranked emotional intelligence and intellectual abilities as key capabilities in a Professional Capability Framework. Principals considered that these priorities made sense given the problems that principals typically deal with and the need for them to stay calm, keep things in perspective and listen to various view points. Other capabilities identified in the framework included:

- generic job skills and knowledge;
- job-specific skills and knowledge;
- social and personal emotional intelligence;
- contingent ways of thinking; and
- diagnostic maps developed from previous experiences that help to read the dilemma situation.

Based on this research, Scott (2003) developed recommendations for improving the professional development of principals including proposals for flexibility and responsiveness in professional learning and mentoring programs for leaders.

However, a study of school leadership standards has revealed such variability between frameworks as to question the defensibility of these standards. Taken together, the lists of capabilities and competencies identified are extensive but there are also considerable overlaps (and potential tensions) in the types of capabilities and competencies articulated in the frameworks (APAPDC, 2005; Leithwood, Jantzi & Steinbach; Spry & Duignan, 2003). Leithwood, Jantzi and Steinbach (2002b) undertook a quantitative, comparative analysis of five sets of school leadership standards. These were the ISLLC (USA), Queensland Standards Framework for Leaders, National Standards for Headteachers (UK), Principal Performance Management (NZ), and the Connecticut Standards (USA). The frameworks were tested against empirically-based evidence and...
accountability requirements relating to 121 leadership practices. Results showed that the frameworks were quite varied and uneven in the extent to which they accounted for the full range of leadership practices. Common omissions in the frameworks included:

- references to teacher leadership;
- key capabilities such as balancing tasks;
- managing teacher efficacy and morale;
- managing the consequences of high-stakes testing; and
- engaging in the marketing and entrepreneurial functions of schools.

Using an historical analysis of standards developments in the UK and USA, Gronn (2002) has found that the character and implementation of standards also differs in locations for cultural reasons.

In addition, there are questions as to whether standards frameworks for school leadership achieve their desired outcomes, and whether their impact is positive or negative. There is a lack of evidence of the impacts of these frameworks on leaders and student outcomes. Whilst Leithwood, Jantzi and Steinbach’s (2002) analyses focused on the content of standards frameworks there has been little research into the impact of leadership frameworks and professional learning programs on the school leadership of teachers and principals, their retention and succession. In the UK, the development of standards and associated leadership training programs have been questioned for homogenising prospective school leaders and reducing the suitability of appointees for diverse school communities (Gunter, 2001). There is a lack of evidence of the impacts of these frameworks on leaders and student outcomes, and investigations of the links between standards frameworks and student outcomes need to be deepened.

3.5 Conclusion

This chapter began with evidence from an array of extended and immediate contextual factors of varying complexity and dynamism that affect quality school leadership. Evidence of the ways in which quality school leaders capacity-build their school communities to have indirect influences on school and student performances was then provided. The specific question of whether the principal’s role is best occupied by a single person or a team has been raised. Whilst current evidence shows that quality school leadership is pluralistic and distributed, several studies concluded that principals play a vital role. Given the early stages in the development of co-principalship and role-sharing in leadership, these areas provide opportunities for future research. Ways of supporting the development of shared leadership relationships and capabilities, as well as how to support the in-school developments that might be needed in implementing such structures, are also areas for future investigation.

The professional practices, attributes and capabilities that enable leaders to do more than endure and work with robust hope through times of complex and continuous change is an area in need of constant investigation. More research is required also to establish how leaders develop community awareness, and transfer and adapt this knowledge when they change locations. Likewise, additional research about leaders in action is needed to develop knowledge of how the professional practices, attributes and capabilities of quality leaders can be developed and how they interact with diverse tasks and contexts.
Schools are among the institutions through which the Australian public is informed and formed, and as a consequence education research itself can influence, and respond to, important areas of public debate. Education research provides a basis for public deliberations about schooling, about public policy, and in particular about the teaching profession, its status, standards and directions.

The teaching profession is not a passive object of education research. Through research, as well as through other processes, the teaching profession is able to play an active role in the elaboration and defence of its own standards, accreditation, and standing. It can participate in shaping its own directions, defining needs and interests which become incorporated into policy, practice and frameworks of excellence.

From synthesis of the literature and nationwide consultations with representatives of the profession for this report, a number of issues for further research have been identified. These focus on developing, nurturing and sustaining quality teaching and school leadership:

- understanding the context and impact of quality teaching and school leadership;
- determining and nurturing attributes and capabilities for quality teaching and school leadership;
- determining and communicating the professional practices of quality teachers and school leaders;
- attracting and sustaining quality teachers and school leaders; and
- the role of professional standards in quality teaching and school leadership.

### 4.1 Understanding the context and impact

#### 4.1.1 Impact of different contexts on education practices

Research highlights the impact of changing economic, political and policy conditions on quality teaching and school leadership. Efforts to re-shape teachers’ work and workplace arrangements may in themselves have a negative impact upon the lives and work of teachers, including high job demands, emotional exhaustion and stress. The literature tends to focus on providing information about positive examples of quality teaching; areas for further investigation should include the dilemmas or barriers to quality teaching and how they can be overcome at the system, school and class levels.

The diversity of schools and the transferability of practice are also important issues in articulating what ‘quality’ practice looks like in different contexts. Research findings suggest the need for caution in transferring the policies and practices of leaders from one school to another without due consideration of their appropriateness in the extended or specific school context. To this end a critical limitation in school improvement and school effectiveness research has been an inadequate appreciation of the cultural diversity within and between schools, and teachers’ responses to this diversity. Among the areas warranting further investigation are:

- how changes to teachers’ work affect the quality of their teaching and students’ learning outcomes, particularly in Australian contexts;
- the impact of any immediate contextual factors on quality school leadership and learning outcomes, including the relationships between differing school contexts and pedagogies, diverse student groups, their forms of knowledge and their learning achievements; and
- the role assessment plays in the adjustments teachers make to their teaching in different contexts.

#### 4.1.2 Creating contexts to develop capacity

Research that focuses on leaders in action reveals much about the contextual and contingent ways in which leaders operate. An important area for study is what forms of support enhance quality in schools and how immediate and extended contexts can be created to enhance the capacity for quality teaching and school leadership.

The literature documents the effects of diverse communities on quality teaching and school leadership. Since each school and its extended and immediate contexts are so different, it would be useful to study leaders who efficiently develop community awareness, transfer and adapt knowledge as they change locations. Similarly, an area in need of further investigation is the transferability of quality teaching practice to different school contexts:

- how quality teachers transfer their knowledge, skills and understandings from one context to another;
- the processes of adaptation that are undertaken;
- the sources of support they draw upon and for what purposes; and
- the ways in which diverse teacher groups engage with quality teaching pedagogies.

Challenging schools should be an area of special study. There is considerable evidence indicating the central policies and practices of leadership that may be effective in challenging contexts. However, there is little research into how leaders go about encouraging and implementing a focus on enhanced learning in challenging schools and in particular, the processes successful leaders use to develop attitudinal and behavioural transformations.
4.1.3 Controlling the curriculum

There is mixed evidence from the research in regards to the merits of centralised control of curriculum as opposed to school-based curriculum development.

- What is the differential effect of centralised and school-based curriculum on quality teaching and student outcomes?
- How can a balance be struck between centralised curriculum control, public accountability and the individual contextual needs of students, teachers and schools?

4.1.4 The interaction of technology with quality teaching?

Investigation of the effect of technology on teaching has tended to occur in subject-specific areas like literacy, technology and educational computing, and in the role of technology in class- and school-based changes to curriculum. However, it is important to know if, how and why the use of multiple technologies by teachers (personally and/or professionally) influences or is influenced by their teaching quality.

4.1.5 The effect of quality teaching on student achievement

Literature on the effect of quality teaching has brought a significant focus on student academic outcomes but there appears to be research gaps on the effect quality teaching may have on students' cognitive, social, physical and emotional capabilities. This may link to the need for further research on the relational attributes and capabilities of interpersonal care, integrity and emotional intelligence.

4.1.6 School leader impact on teacher practice and student achievement

Leadership theory development has not been grounded in the details of effective teaching and learning, making it difficult to show the difference leadership makes to student outcomes. There is a need for innovative approaches to research how quality school leadership impacts on students' socio-academic outcomes through quality teaching and learning.

4.1.7 Impact of teachers and students as leaders on student achievement

Evidence shows that, supported and resourced by their school principals, teacher-leaders improve their own instructional, leadership and organisational skills through exposure to new information and instructional experiences. However, there is limited evidence of the influence of teacher-leaders on the practices of their colleagues. Evidence of the effect of teachers-as-leaders on student outcomes is mixed and further research would provide the profession with more definitive understandings of:

- relationships between teacher-leaders and student outcomes;
- the collegial processes that effective teacher-leaders use; and
- the school cultures and structures that positively support teacher-leaders.

Similarly, there is a need for more research in the area of students-as-leaders and their impact on students' social and academic outcomes.

4.2 Determining and nurturing attributes and capabilities

4.2.1 Important personal, relational, organisational and professional attributes and capabilities. How are they acquired?

There appear to be research gaps around some of the personal, relational and organisational attributes and capabilities identified in quality teaching and school leadership.

- How does the vision of quality teachers and school leaders affect student outcomes?
- What effect does good management have on quality teaching?
- What is the effect of distributing or sharing power?
- What is the relationship between interpersonal care, integrity and quality teaching?
- What role does emotional intelligence play in quality teaching?
- What is the effect of initial teacher education on the development of the attributes and capabilities of quality teaching?

Much of the literature on the attributes and capabilities of quality school leaders explores the categories of personal, relational, professional and organisational skills. However, the research is not clear about how these attributes and capabilities are learnt. More also needs to be known about the qualifications needed for a quality school leader who can affect quality teaching and student outcomes.

- What is the place of formal qualifications in developing school leaders? Of non-formal learning?
- What is the relationship between the type of qualification and the effects of the quality school leader?
- Is it possible for value-based qualities to be learned or formed, and if so, how can this be done effectively?
- How are characteristics of passion and robust hope developed and expressed in diverse leadership roles?
- How can vision and goals be developed and who should take the lead, if they are to be shared meaningfully?
It is interesting that the research literature identifies more qualities associated with effective school leaders than for quality teaching. The reason for this could in itself be subject to further investigation.

4.3 Determining and communicating professional practices

4.3.1 Professional practices of quality school leaders

There is limited research on the core practices of leadership and the dilemmas of professional leadership (and ways of overcoming these dilemmas). A clear identification of the professional practices of quality school leaders can be problematic because the research literature draws heavily on individual cases as exemplars and primarily focuses on determining if an effective school leader was demonstrating a particular style of leadership. Studies do not generally consider the school leaders’ professional practices in action and what they encompass.

- What professional practices do quality school leaders encompass in their role?
- How can professional practices of quality school leaders be understood and assessed without comparing them to a particular style of leadership?

4.3.2 Shared leadership and collaboration

Research suggests the school leadership role is now too complex to be the responsibility of a single person and shared leadership is being promoted as a possible alternative. Given the early stages in the development of co-principalship and role-sharing in leadership, these are areas for future research:

- whether the role of the school leader is best occupied by a single person (the principal), or a co-sharing arrangement;
- the nature and appropriateness of support for shared leadership relationships and capabilities; and
- in-school developments which enable shared leadership to occur.

Collaboration was considered to be important in developing quality teaching. Areas for further investigation include:

- the relationship between different forms of collaboration and teacher leadership, quality teaching and enhanced student learning outcomes;
- the sustainability of different types of collaborative and teacher leadership practices; and
- possible initiatives to promote renewed partnerships between schools and parents/caregivers.

4.4 Attracting and sustaining quality teaching and school leadership

4.4.1 Attracting and maintaining school leaders

Evidence suggests that there may be a crisis in attracting and maintaining school leaders as teachers elect not to take on school leadership roles or responsibilities—including the role of principal. These findings raise the question of which qualities and specific skills enable leaders to do more than endure, but rather to work through challenging times of change with robust hope. Is there a relationship between personal and professional attributes and capabilities, length of experience and retention of quality teachers and school leaders?

Moreover, if leadership is an interaction between the leader; the task and the context, then research needs to be undertaken on how we can develop the next generation of leaders to be effective for unknown contexts. A variety of strategies therefore, must continue to be developed to attract, develop, support and train quality school leaders. Amongst other things, the outcomes and effects of leadership mentoring, coaching and work-shadowing programs need to be documented.

4.4.2 Rewarding quality teachers

There is a need for research into the effect of different motivations on teachers’ commitment to the profession, retention in the profession, efficacy in their performance and students’ learning outcomes. The research literature points to the need to provide some form of reward for quality teaching beyond the personal satisfaction that teachers gain. It also suggests that rewards should encourage teachers to stay in the classroom, not just take on further leadership roles in a school. So what form should the rewards take? Different rewards are likely to affect quality teaching in different ways and to have different effects on maintaining quality teachers in classrooms and promoting quality teaching. Financial rewards have to be managed and regulated but at what level—national or State? Governments considering tying rewards for quality teaching to student outcomes are inviting questions about what forms of student assessment are appropriate when used at a school and/or systems level for recognising, rewarding and enhancing quality teaching.

4.4.3 Ongoing professional learning

Ongoing professional learning is considered necessary in relation to ways of enhancing—and the effect of context on—quality teaching and school leadership. One area warranting further scrutiny is how ongoing professional learning promotes teacher collaboration and leadership and knowledge transfer about quality teaching and school improvement.
4.5 Professional standards, quality teaching and school leadership

4.5.1 Impact of professional standards

Research on the impact of professional standards on quality teaching and student outcomes is not large because this is a relatively new approach being taken by education authorities. However, the literature has identified a number of areas for further study which may usefully inform the profession and education authorities. There is a need for policy-makers to know:

• how professional standards can be used in the professional development of teachers and school leaders;
• how professional standards impact on quality teaching, school leadership and student outcomes (whether they achieve the desired outcomes); and
• how their growth and operation may enhance the status of the teaching profession and school leadership, and facilitate improvements in student learning.

4.5.2 Implementation of professional standards

In Australia, there is a need for research to be undertaken into questions such as:

• what professional standards encompass—or should encompass—for a knowledge society;
• how professional standards for school leaders can be developed;
• whether school leaders should be registered, and if so how this could be achieved and managed; and
• how assessment of the teaching profession and school leadership can accommodate alternative forms of education provision and policies.

4.6 Conclusion

The issues for research presented in this chapter have been derived from the review and synthesis of the literature produced over the past six years. Other issues are also likely to become evident or take on importance over the next few years as the profession redefines itself to meet the needs of students and a changing society.
As discussed in Chapter 3, much research has been conducted investigating the so-called ‘knowledge society’ in which knowledge production, knowledge transfer and knowledge networking have emerged as critical capabilities. However, as Fullan (2002) reported, historically schools have been weak at knowledge building and sharing. It is important to identify not only the data needed by classroom practitioners and school and system leaders, but also how best to engage educators and policy makers in collecting, using and sharing evidence to improve teaching practice and student outcomes. Moreover, through research the teaching profession can participate in shaping its own directions and contribute to the development of policy, practice and frameworks of excellence.

This chapter will attempt to address five issues:

- Understanding and supporting knowledge transfer;
- the need for a quality teaching and school leadership database;
- suggested content;
- encouraging engagement; and
- how the database should operate and be maintained.

5.1 Understanding and supporting knowledge transfer

There is widespread agreement that it is important to focus on knowledge transfer so that research has a greater impact on the day-to-day life of schools, teachers and education leaders. It is also important that research-based knowledge reaches the profession in an appropriate form so educators might apply or further develop it. One possibility for activating increased knowledge transfer and engagement is for greater direct collaboration between university-based education researchers, teachers and other school leaders in producing research-based knowledge. The promotion of such collaborative research linkages is important for reducing the gap between knowledge production and its use.

The Phillips KPA (2006) report, commissioned by the Australian Government Department of Education, Science and Training, noted that the concept ‘knowledge transfer’ is used in different ways and contexts. The term ‘knowledge transfer’ in industry and business normally refers to knowledge transfer for commercial benefit, while knowledge transfer in other sectors may aim at broader economic, social and environmental benefits. Thus, knowledge transfer was defined as:

Effective knowledge transfer strategies rely on the capacity of institutions to shape their knowledge transfer approaches and activities in partnership with their various communities, and to respond creatively to the distinctive needs of those communities. From this perspective, a ‘healthy’ system of knowledge transfer should demonstrate considerable diversity in knowledge transfer approaches and activities, both within and across institutions and across disciplines and national research priorities (Phillips KPA, 2006, iv).

Based on feedback from the consultations and key findings from the review and synthesis of recent research literature, this project has identified a gap in the existing knowledge transfer and engagement system. It suggests that a dedicated database might provide a vehicle for enhancing quality teaching and school leadership and for enhancing the status of the profession.

5.2 The need for a database

What might be done in order to develop a useful and effective database for the teaching profession and education community, including parents? A first step is to identify the purpose of the database, establish the basis for its identity and niche, and then commence construction of a relevant, useful resource.

5.2.1 Identifying the niche

Supplementing but not duplicating existing databases

It is important that such a database does not replicate, but supplements what is already available to the Australian educational community. Participants in the consultations expressed reservations regarding the development of yet another database. They pointed to important databases that already exist, including Education Network Australia (EDNA) (http://www.edna.edu.au/edna/page1.html) and the Professional Learning Online Tool (PLOT) (http://www.plotpd.com/FAQs/?FAQCategoryID=26).

Overlap may be acceptable but duplication would be seen as a waste of valuable resources, especially money, by those who would be the target users of such a service. Given that there are already many databases it would be important to establish the point of difference for this database.

Ensuring teacher engagement

Simply creating a database does not necessarily mean the profession will use it. As Brazelton and Gorry (2003, p. 23) report, ‘if you just build it, people will not come.’ Such a database would need to be planned so as to provide a fundamental support integral to teachers’ professional enhancement and the driver for them accessing it. It should also create an online environment that is likely to engage teachers and school leaders in regular interaction.

5.2.2 Uses

There could be several purposes associated with such an important initiative. There is interest in a database that could inform and influence education policy and teaching practice; contribute to forming and informing the intellectual leadership of the profession, and build a stronger research-based culture through the education profession. Specifically, a gap exists in the provision of a national web-based service for accessing relevant,
up-to-date research for the education profession about issues relating to:

- professional standards and accreditation;
- professional learning and course accreditation;
- research and communication; and
- promotion of the profession.

5.3 Content
The proposed database would enable nationwide dissemination of research and related information so that the teaching profession could inform its practices based on substantial, sound research. In order to support education professionals it is proposed that the database includes features such as access to relevant information, current research and working papers, links to online resources and so forth as detailed below.

5.3.1 Access to relevant information
Bulletin boards would provide information on ‘hot topics’ that could be used to discuss the latest issues and development relating to the profession, such as the creation and maintenance of teacher-centred professional development. This could provide an introduction to policies, data and debates that might better inform teachers.

5.3.2 Current research and working papers
The database could provide a place for responses to questions about what research has found about a particular issue—like the UK’s National Foundation for Educational Research (http://www.nfer.ac.uk/index.cfm) which provides briefs based on the latest research and an account of the educational implications for classroom practice. It could also include reports of research in progress.

5.3.3 Creating links to existing online resources
One way of avoiding duplication and providing access to content is through creating links to online resources that already exist. For example, it would be important to make links to sites which contain current research such as the National Council for School Leadership (http://www.ncsl.org.uk) in the area of effective school leadership.

Professional associations and organisations
There would need to be links to professional associations and related educational organisations, their core documents and online conferences, such as the:

- Australian Principals Associations Professional Development Council (http://www.apapdc.edu.au/)
- Australian Association for Research in Education (http://www.aare.edu.au/index.htm)
- Teaching Australia (http://www.teachingaustralia.edu.au/)
- Australian College of Education (http://www.austcolled.com.au/)
- Curriculum Corporation (http://www.curriculum.edu.au/)
- Australian Council for Educational Research (http://www.acer.edu.au/)
- Australian Council of Deans of Education (http://www.acde.edu.au/)

International trends
Further, although the main focus would be on Australian education, it was also seen as important for teachers and other school leaders to be aware of international trends and developments in education. There are also websites in the USA, the UK, Canada and New Zealand which might have some relevance to Australian teachers and school leaders.

5.3.4 Exemplars of best practice in audio, film, written text
To support beginning teachers and school leaders it would be useful to have information on leading-edge school approaches to improving the social and academic outcomes of students, as well as suggested approaches to transforming curriculum, pedagogy, and assessment. This could be modelled on the US-based Coalition of Essential Schools (http://www.essentialschools.org/) or Rethinking Schools Online (http://www.rethinkingschools.org/).

5.3.5 Professional development online
Important local and national professional learning activities could include nurturing school leaders and strategies for succession planning. The database could provide for professional development opportunities including videos of lectures by education researchers and demonstrations of research-based practices (Brazelton & Gorry, 2003). (See also Sections 5.4.2 and 5.4.3 below.)

5.3.6 Development of an online community for professional exchanges
The database could also support the development of an online community as a site for professional exchange and discussion among teachers and other school leaders. Electronic Community of Teachers (ECOT) (http://ecot.rice.edu/) offers a useful model in this regard. This could include:
• the capacity to form productive chat groups, discussion groups or forums (Brazelton & Gorry, 2003; Bruckman, 2002; Selwyn, 2000). To assist ongoing discussion and maximise effectiveness it may be advisable to propose questions whereby responses may lead to further reflection and inquiry (Al-Bataineh, Brooks & Bassoppo-Moyo, 2005, p. 286). Discussion questions may also be organised into a table format where responses are only viewed by choice.

• online mentoring—especially for school leaders—whereby ‘groups of online learners can motivate and support one another’s learning experiences’ (Bruckman, 2002, p. 60). This may occur in real-time chats or as part of an ongoing chat group, discussion group or forum.

5.3.7 Online accreditation and certification opportunities

Online accreditation and certification opportunities could include links to different accreditation processes, and teaching standards for beginning teachers and continuing teachers in Australia and overseas. Over time the profession could contribute with exemplars and case studies of personal experiences.

5.3.8 Direct support for education professionals

Content could also be provided to give teachers and other school leaders direct support. It is suggested that there could be:

• an ‘ask an expert’ service which includes a source of people who might be able to help on a range of topics. These could then be stored in a FAQ section;

• interactive capacity to work through online scenarios and then have an electronic chat with other practitioners and a ‘web expert’. This could include a changing focus on one area of research. Again the scenario and discussion could be archived, similar to those available at Reading-Online (http://www.readingonline.org);

• related policy documents, issues papers and government reform agendas; and

• links to teaching resources.

A section on teaching ideas and resources could be interactive, so as to be developed by the profession itself. This ‘hot teaching ideas’ section could be linked to discussions about the integration of Internet sites into classroom instruction, or the evaluation of sites by others.

5.4 Encouraging engagement

The following ideas are proposed as a means of providing the content in a way that is accessible to the education community and encourages engagement.

5.4.1 Contributing exemplars

A means of encouraging teachers and school leaders to access resources and research would be to enable the education community to contribute exemplars to the database through the research that members of the profession conduct themselves. Guidelines on a range of qualitative and quantitative research methods could be included and templates for submission of exemplary studies would need to be provided. To reward contributions and enhance teachers’ professional standing, funding could be provided for teacher-based and/or school-based research in areas such as those identified in Chapter 4. In this way teachers would be able to inform debates and discussions within the education community.

5.4.2 Performance appraisal and reporting

An interactive research database might be used by groups of teachers and school leaders as a means of performance appraisal and professional development. For example:

• individual and group self-evaluative data could be generated using research-based criteria relating to quality teaching and school leadership;

• the database could be used in an individual’s assessment of their performance and for yearly performance appraisal targets; and

• it could be used for the preparation of reports by and for beginning teachers.

5.4.3 Performance improvement and the use of a self-assessment schedule

Based on the score obtained via the self-assessment process, teachers and school leaders could then be advised as to appropriate research findings in areas relevant to improving the quality of their teaching and/or school leadership. In other words, the individuals’ and/or groups’ self-evaluative data could act as a springboard for further professional development, linking to the research and/or other resources on the site. Those teachers and other school leaders whose self-assessment results indicated high quality performance could be directed to additional research in areas of their professional interest and/or strengths, and also to groups and situations where they may contribute their strengths to the teaching profession more widely. In particular, they could be invited to apply for research funds, in collaboration with others, to undertake research in areas where there are gaps in current research-based knowledge, and thereby contribute to the generation of knowledge for inclusion in the database.
5.4.4 Celebrating success and recognising achievements

The database could also serve as a site for celebrating the successes and recognising the achievement of quality teaching and school leadership. Among the many different forms of public recognition of the profession’s quality, this could also include those who rate highly on their self-assessment schedule using the database.

5.4.5 Identifying areas requiring research

From the review of the research literature, the gaps that are identified could be acknowledged in the database. This could provide a springboard for teachers, other school leaders and others in the education profession to research and report new knowledge in these areas. Teachers and other school leaders who are undertaking (or know of) quality research in an area identified as a gap could be invited to contribute such material for review and possible inclusion in the database. They could be invited to submit for review the results of the research they have undertaken in their schools (such as individual or team-based research), including research undertaken for higher degrees. In this way the database could act as a site of knowledge creation as well as of knowledge dissemination.

5.5 Creating the database and maintaining the online environment

5.5.1 Mechanisms to facilitate searching

Education professionals have a limited amount of time to locate relevant information, so the provision of a search facility that helps the user to locate this information is essential. It has to be intuitive to the user but could also provide direction to assist them. The value of the development of an online database could be a ‘one shop’ point of access to relevant information rather than the ad hoc and time-consuming approach many teachers presently use.

Suggested categories

It is proposed that one search function be organised around sub-categories for quality teaching and school leadership, such as those presented in this report.

- A first level of access might be to select from ‘quality teaching’ or ‘school leadership,’ albeit with the database set up to enable cross-selection and identification of relevant data. (Another option for identifying a user’s interest level could be by primary or secondary sectors.)
- A second level of access would use a drop-down menu, from which users would make their own selections.

Once all these have been selected the database could search through the data included and provide a user with results in the form of research papers, online research links, exemplars and professional associations as suggested above.

Key word searches

Another function to be provided would enable keyword searches. Key words could be suggested based on the sub-categories in the three domains for quality teaching and school leadership as well as allowing open-ended searches of the database.

Searching core areas or themes

Search categories could also be formed around the core areas of:

- professional standards and accreditation;
- professional learning and course accreditation;
- research and communication relating to these matters, and
- the promotion of the profession.

Content-specific material would be best covered by other databases, for example, those of professional associations.

Searches initiated through self-assessment schedules

In addition, a self-assessment schedule completed by a teacher or other school leader could initiate a search of the database. The result of this search would be relevant specifically to the professional accessing the database and is another type of search function.

5.5.2 Ownership and maintenance of the database

Such a database would ideally be independent of government. This would enable teachers and other school leaders to use it as a vehicle to open up discussions and to disseminate information, rather than close off or shut down such educational conversations.

Finally it is essential that the database and its online environment be kept up-to-date and well managed. Failure to do so would mean that the profession would not continue to use it because of poor quality facilities and services.
PARTICIPANTS IN CONSULTATION MEETINGS

ACT Association for the Teaching of English (ACTATE)
ACT Council of Parents & Citizens Associations
ACT Department of Education and Training
ACT Society and Environment Association (ACTSEA)
ACT Teachers in Vocational Education (ACTTIVE)
Art Educators of the NT (AENT)
Association of Heads of Independent Schools of Australia (AHISA)
Association of Independent Schools of New South Wales (AISNSW)
Association of Independent Schools of SA (AISSA)
Association of Independent Schools of Tasmania (AIST)
Association of Independent Schools of Victoria (AISV)
Association of Northern Territory School Educational Leaders (ANTSEL)
Association of Post Compulsory Educators (Qld) Inc (APEC(Q) INC)
Association of Principals of Catholic Secondary Schools of Australia (APCSSA)
Association of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (ATESOL)
Australian Association for Environmental Education (AAEE)
Australian Association of Special Education (AASE)
Australian Association of Teachers of the Deaf (AATD), Victorian Branch
Australian Associations of Christian Schools (AACS)
Australian Catholic Primary Principals’ Association (ACPPA)
Australian College of Educators (ACE)
Australian Council for Computers in Education (ACCE)
Australian Council for Education Leaders (ACEL)
Australian Council for Health, Physical Education and Recreation, Western Australian Branch (ACHPER WA)
Australian Council of Deans of Education (ACDE)
Australian Education Union (AEU)
Australian Government Primary Principals’ Association (AGPPA)
Australian Joint Council of Professional Teaching Associations (AJCPTA)
Australian Literacy Educators’ Association (ALEA)
Australian National Schools Network (ANSN)
Australian Primary Principals Association (APPAA)
Australian Principals Associations Professional Development Council (APAPDC)
Australian School Library Association (ASLA)
Australian Secondary Principals Association (ASPA)
Beginning and Establishing Teachers’ Association (BETA)
Business and Enterprise Teachers’ Association of South Australia (BETASA)
Careers Advisers’ Association of NSW (CAA NSW Inc)
Catholic Assistant Principals’ Association of WA (CAPA)
Catholic Education NT (CENT)
Catholic Education Office (CEO)
Catholic Education Office Melbourne
Christian Parent Controlled Schools Ltd (CPCS)
Christian Schools Tasmania (CST)
Council of ACT Education Associations (COACTEA)
Council of Education Associations of South Australia (CEASA)
Council of Government School Organisations (COGSO)
Council of Professional Teaching Associations of Victoria (CPTAV)
Department of Employment, Education and Training (DEET) (NT)
Early Childhood Education Council of New South Wales (ECEC)
Early Childhood Organisation (EChO)
Economics Teachers’ Association of Western Australia Inc (ETAWA)
Education Queensland
Educational Computing Association of Western Australia (Inc) (ECAWA)
English Teachers’ Association of Queensland Inc (ETAQ)
English Teachers’ Association of the Northern Territory (ETANT)
Federation of Parents and Friends Associations of Catholic Schools Qld
Geography Teachers’ Association of NSW Inc (GTA)
German Language Teachers’ Association
Hands on Consultancy
History Teachers’ Association of Victoria (HTAV)
Home Economics Institute of Australia (HEIA)
Independent Education Union of Australia (IEU)
Joint Council of Queensland Teachers’ Associations (JCQTA)
Junior Schools Heads’ Association West Australian Branch (JSHAA (WA))
Leadership 21 – Consultant
Lutheran Education Australia (LEA)
Mathematical Association of Victoria (MAV)
Middle Schooling Association of Western Australia (MSAWA)
Modern Language Teachers’ Association (MLTA)
NSW Computer Education Group (NSW CEG)
NSW Department of Education and Training
NSW Institute of Teachers
NT Institute of Educational Research (NTIER)
NT Joint Council of Professional Teaching Associations
Parents and Friends Federation of Western Australia Inc (PFFWA)
Parents Victoria (PV)
Principals’ Association of Tasmanian Catholic Secondary Schools (PATCSS)
Principals’ Association of Victorian Catholic Secondary Schools (PAVCSS)
Queensland Association of Mathematics Teachers (QAMT)
Queensland History Teachers’ Association Inc (QHTA)
Queensland Teachers’ Union (QTU)
Remedial and Support Teachers’ Association of Queensland (RSTAQ)
School Leadership Development Unit in the Victorian Department of Education and Training
Science Teachers’ Association of NSW Inc (STANSW)
Science Teachers’ Association of Victoria (STAV)
South Australian Association of State School Organisations (SAASSO)
South Australian Centre for Leaders in Education (SACLE)
South Australian Primary Principals Association (SAPPA)
State School Teachers’ Union of WA (Inc) (SSTUWA)
Studies of Society and Environment Association Queensland Inc. (SOSEAQ)
Tasmanian Catholic Education Employees’ Association (TCEEA)
Tasmanian Secondary Principals Association (TSPA)
Tasmanian Society for Information Technology in Education (TASITE)
Tasmanian State School Parents and Friends Inc (TASSP&F)
Teacher Registration Board of the Northern Territory (TRB)
Technology School of the Future (TSoF)
VETnetwork Australia
Victorian Association of Social Studies Teachers (VASST)
Victorian Association of State Secondary Principals (VASSP)
Victorian Commercial Teachers Association Inc. (VCTA)
Victorian Council of School Organisations Inc (VICCSO)
Victorian Department of Education and Training
Victorian Independent Education Union – Catholic Primary Principals Association (VIEU – CPPA)
WA Leadership Centre
Western Australian College of Teaching
Western Australian Council of State School Organisations Inc (WACSSO)
Western Australian Department of Education and Training
Western Australian Institute for Educational Research (WAIER)
Western Australian Secondary School Executives Association (WASSEA)
certification - formal recognition of an individual’s qualifications by a certifying body.

contingent leadership - uses a range of skills that can be adapted to suit specific contexts, with the aim of getting the most from the school community.

co-principalship (or shared principalship) - the principal’s role shared between two or more people.

distributive leadership (or participative, or democratic leadership) - actively involves all stakeholders in the community of the school as a complex organisation, with the goal of capacity building.

instructional, pedagogical or educative leadership - facilitates ongoing development of teaching and learning as a central focus for staff.

interpersonal / emotional leadership - leadership based on a high level of interpersonal skills and emotional intelligence, which develops a shared culture of care; investing in individuals as much as in systems and structures.

managerial leadership - leadership focusing on financial, organisational, accountability and personnel issues of school business.

moral leadership - leadership based on a shared set of values and beliefs to give the school a sense of purpose and shared goals.

parallel leadership - a form of leadership in which principals assume responsibility for strategic leadership such as visioning, aligning resources and networking, while teachers assume primary responsibility for pedagogical or instructional leadership.

qualification - the qualities, skills or accomplishments that make a person suitable for a role.

scaffolding - a temporary support mechanism by which students receive assistance early on to complete tasks, then as their proficiency increases, that support is gradually removed. In this fashion the student takes on more and more responsibility for their own learning.

stakeholders - all those with a close interest or involvement in education. They include, among others, parents and carers, teachers, school leaders, students, employers, governments and the wider community.

transductive or transactional leadership - builds a culture of support and nurturing of staff that is based on mutual rewards.

transformational leadership - leadership that encourages all staff to unite to pursue a common grounded vision and higher level goals.
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